

ARGUMENTS
ON BEHALF OF THE COMPLAINANTS
IN
THE ANDOVER CASE

Delivered Dec. 30, 31, 1886

LIBRARY

3429

Pacific Theological Seminary.

ALCOVE,

SHELF,

PRESENTED BY

Henry M. Dexter



The Library of the

Pacific Theological Seminary,

for

Henry M. Dexter

*Before the Board of Visitors of Andover
Theological Seminary.*

ARGUMENTS
ON BEHALF OF THE COMPLAINANTS,

IN THE MATTER OF THE

COMPLAINT AGAINST EGBERT C. SMYTH,

Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History,

HEARD DEC. 28, 29, 30, 31, 1886



BOSTON:
RAND AVERY COMPANY.

Franklin Press.

1887.



BX

7243

S6

A53

1887

TX 67.3
~~A 246~~

COPYRIGHT, 1887,
BY RAND AVERY COMPANY.

ARGUMENT OF HON. ASA FRENCH.

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors:

I HAVE listened with very great interest, with instruction, and I trust, also, with profit, to the learned and eloquent arguments which have been addressed to you by the other side. Nevertheless, much of what has been said by counsel — they will pardon me for saying — has seemed to me to be somewhat discursive, and wholly outside of the real question at issue in this case. And it may not be inappropriate, at this stage of the proceedings, after two full days have been consumed in presenting these arguments, to recall the maxim of good old Dr. Witherspoon, of blessed memory. It was this:—

“In public speaking, avoid all hard words; if you have anything to say, say it, and, when you have said it, stop.”

I shall endeavor, Mr. President, in what I shall say, to conform to this excellent maxim.

Much complaint has been made by the learned counsel that we gave them no sufficient notice beforehand of what our charges were — that we made no formal opening at this trial, but contented ourselves with putting in our documentary evidence, and there rested. And they would have it understood that we have thus taken an unfair advantage.

It is the first time in my observation that such able and eminent gentlemen of the bar as represent the Respondent here, have argued a question for ten mortal hours without knowing what the issue was, and that a Respondent, speaking in his own behalf, has occupied nearly half that time in attempting to refute ambiguous charges, which were, nevertheless, so clear to his apprehension that he could denounce them as frivolous and utterly groundless!

Why, there is not a single person who has read these charges and specifications, as they have appeared in the public prints, who

does not know, and know exactly, what the charges are which this Respondent is called upon to meet.

It was not, Mr. President, until after the commencement of this trial, that I had expected to take any part in the discussion. The questions at issue seemed to belong so largely to the domain of theology, to the true interpretation of the Andover Creed, and the proper construction to be put upon the published writings of the Respondent when examined in the light of that Creed, that I did not feel myself competent to render any assistance to this Reverend and Honorable Board in the discharge of the grave and solemn duty which devolves upon it.

But, at the suggestion of my associates, I venture to comment briefly upon some of the points raised by the other side.

Need I say, Mr. President, that our evidence and arguments are addressed to this tribunal, and not to the public, for with you, and you alone, rests the determination of this momentous question. However pleasant the applause of the crowd, we are not now seeking for that, but rather to convince you, Gentlemen of the Board, that the substantial charges set out in this complaint have been sustained, and that Professor Smyth has "maintained and inculcated" doctrines inconsistent with, and subversive of, the Andover Creed, — a fact which these complainants conscientiously and religiously believe, the epithets and sneers of the Respondent, and some of his counsel, to the contrary notwithstanding.

I shall indulge in no unkind words — (I regret that they have felt it necessary to do so) — for I harbor no unkind feelings.

The learned counsel who opened this case for the defence¹ commented with much severity upon the *form* in which it was first brought to your attention. He grew quite facetious, also, over the fact that one of the signers to the original paper presented to you, had appended the word "Trustee" to his signature, and that they had all represented themselves to be a "Committee of certain of the Alumni," whereas in the amended complaint no such words of designation were used, but their names only were affixed, and that by attorney.

And he plainly charged that the claim on their part that they were acting as representatives of anybody else was an assumption and a pretence. "Studied duplicity" was the courteous term which he applied to it; and he added that "conduct like this at the Bar would gain the scorn of the legal profession;" and that

¹ Prof. T. W. Dwight.

the signers had "forfeited the confidence of all candid, truth-speaking men!"

This is strong language towards such eminent gentlemen as appear in this complaint, and it is unpardonable language, unless supported by the facts.

What are the facts, and in what does this "studied duplicity" consist?

On the 6th of July, of the present year, the original complaint was presented to this Board, signed by these three gentlemen as a committee of certain of the Alumni, and by one of them, Dr. Wellman, as a Trustee of Phillips Academy, which nobody denies that he was and is. Nowhere does he claim, even by inference, in this proceeding, to act for any other member of that Board, and any suggestion to the contrary, whensoever, or by whomsoever, made, is absolutely without foundation.

It would have been entirely competent and proper for them to file these charges in their individual capacity, but they chose the other form because, in fact, they had been selected as a committee for the purpose; and the deliberate declaration of three gentlemen, whose integrity and veracity the counsel has the honor of questioning for the first time, I put against his unsupported imputation!

Having thus called the attention of your Honorable Board to these charges, they understood that their duty in the premises was ended, and that you would proceed with the investigation in your own time and way.

Due notice of the complaint was given to the Respondent, and to his co-Respondents, — (for they were all joined in that complaint), — and they were called upon to make answer. But, instead of an answer to the merits, admitting or denying the charges, there came a paper, prepared by able and acute counsel, in the nature of a demurrer, or plea in abatement, setting up every conceivable technical objection to the consideration of these charges by your Board.

Whether this course was taken because they, or their counsel, distrusted the wisdom, integrity and impartiality of this tribunal, or because they preferred a tribunal which had already prejudged the case, or for whatever other reason, I know not.

These objections were, —

1. That this Board has not original jurisdiction of the subject matter.¹

¹ The Supreme Court of this State, Chief Justice Parker delivering the opinion, in the Murdock case, 7 Pick. 303, expressly decides that the Board *has* original jurisdiction over such matters.

2. That, even if this Board has jurisdiction, the Trustees of the Institution were already considering the same charges, and that, by well settled rules of law, the later proceeding must give way to the earlier.¹

3. That the case is not presented according to the law laid down in the Murdock case, and that the Complainants have no legal standing in Court.

4. That the Respondents cannot legally be joined in the same complaint.

5. That the charges are too indefinite and vague.

6. That some of the specifications relate to matters not in the Creed, and so are not under the jurisdiction of the Visitors, and —

7. That the proceedings are irregular in other respects.

Now, Mr. President, we make no complaint at this course on the part of the Respondents. They had an undoubted legal right to resort to it, and so to prevent, if possible, a hearing upon the real questions at issue; and I refer to it only as a part of the history of this case, and because *we* have been charged with being “technical and narrow!”

At the hearing upon these objections, October 28th, the Complainants appeared, and, through counsel, admitting that they had no legal right to conduct the trial on the charges, submitted themselves to the direction of the Board.

And whatever part we have since taken in these proceedings has been with your approval, at your request, and as your servants.

The dilatory pleas, to which I have referred, after full argument, were all overruled, except that your Board decreed that the charges should be so amended as to proceed against the Respondents separately, and that such charges as were indefinite should be made plain by further specifications.

In compliance with this decree, the amended complaint was prepared as it now stands. It contains no new matter, except as it sets out quotations from published articles and works of the Respondents in support of the charges.

¹ On Jan. 12, 1886, Dr. Wellman presented to the Board of Trustees, of which he was a member, a resolution, reciting, in substance, that, whereas, it was understood that doctrines were being inculcated by certain Professors at the Seminary not in accordance with the Creed, therefore the Board of Trustees request the Board of Visitors to investigate the matter. The Trustees having declined to adopt this resolution, on the 6th of July following, the present complaint was filed before the Visitors. No similar complaint has ever been pending before the Trustees.

In that form, simply for convenience, it was signed by counsel on behalf of the Complainants. I had no doubt then, nor have I any now, that this was a perfectly legal and proper act. At any rate, I assume the entire responsibility of it, for the Complainants had nothing whatsoever to do with it.

So much, Mr. President and Gentlemen, for the full preliminary history of this case, — and so much for that charge of duplicity and deceit.

Passing from this subject, let us ascertain, if we can, the theory on which this case is defended, because client and counsel do not appear to be in perfect accord upon that point.

The key-note of the defence, as sounded by the same counsel in his opening, was an attack upon the Creed. He had not a single word in commendation of it.

Let me make a few quotations from his printed argument upon this point: —

It [the Creed] is meant as *a clog upon instruction* and may turn out to be a *prohibition against instruction in the truth*. It says to a body of teachers: "You must not teach doctrines because they are true, but because we, the founders, impose them upon you." . . .

The teacher is thus emasculated and the growth of the scholar is one-sided and dwarfed. In the name, not only of the professors under trial, but of all teachers of the land, including, I hope, the Chairman of this Board, I respectfully protest against such shackles of iron upon education. — [Printed Argument of Prof. Dwight, pp. 19, 20.]

They [the professors] are met at the entrance with a *ponderous Creed, smelling of antiquity and the outcome of the fiery struggles of ancient days* — contests of which we have little or no knowledge and, with what we have, as little sympathy. *Its words are technical and uncouth. Its clauses are confused and contradictory.* — [p. 20.]

To tie an institution to such a creed seems like anchoring a vessel in the swift current of a flowing stream *amid the mud and rubbish of bygone ages*; so the Phillipses, Browns and Abbots, noble in their intentions and sincere Christians, *but erring in sound judgment, bedded their little institution on the hills of Andover among the mud and rubbish of extinct controversies.* — [pp. 20, 21.]

I admit that there is a color for the view that some portions of the creeds of Aug. 31, 1807, and March 21, 1808, . . . represent to an extent what may fairly be called the intolerance of orthodoxy. . . . — [p. 45.]

Elusive phrases were sought for. — [p. 47.]

The Andover Creed does not represent the original seamless robe of Calvinism, but, rather, Joseph's coat of varied colors, — one patch of royal purple in its very centre, one wholly colorless, viz., the 'corporeal strength' to repent, surrounded, it may be, by a dark, cold border of unmitigated Calvinism. — [pp. 58, 59.]

Again, "*The Andover Creed is the most mysterious of all.*" — [p. 59.]

Upon page 37, he speaks of it as a "*dreary Creed*"; and upon page 67, "*They [the founders] for a special reason established a creed mainly remarkable for its glaring inconsistencies.*"

He even declared that it was impossible to reconcile this Creed with the Westminster Catechism, thus putting himself in antagonism with the opinion of the Board of Visitors in 1844, upon which so much stress is laid by the Respondent, in which they say that they can see no inconsistency between the two. [Woods's *History of Andover Theo. Sem.* p. 430.]

That opinion held, it is true, that a professor upon the Associate Foundation — as is Prof. Smyth — is not required to subscribe to the Westminster Catechism, as is required in the case of a professor upon the Original Foundation.

While we attach little or no importance to this opinion as applicable to the present case; that it was subsequently dissented from in carefully written opinions by such eminent authorities as Dr. Woods, Dr. Dana, John H. Clifford, Chief Justice Joel Parker, Prof. Simon Greenleaf, Judge Theron Metcalf, and Samuel Farrar, certainly impairs its weight.

Now the necessary logical conclusion from this part of Prof. Dwight's argument is, that the Andover Creed ought to be ignored and put aside whenever it conflicts with the new theology; and that whatever doctrine any professor can honestly declare is better, "according to the best light God has given him," should be substituted in its place, — a proposition which, under the perfectly well established principles of law relating to charitable trusts, is utterly indefensible.

But the learned counsel still further insists that the words "*maintain and inculcate,*" wherever they occur in the Associate Creed to which Prof. Smyth is required to subscribe, are to be interpreted as applying only *to the work of instruction in the Seminary*, or, to put it more tersely, in the language of his associate, Prof. Baldwin, "*When we teach this doctrine [probation after death] to our pupils, it will be time to make this charge.*"

In other words, *any professor in the Andover Seminary may advocate every conceivable heresy in the public press, but, if he is prudently silent upon the subject in his lecture-room, he cannot be molested!*

From such sentiments it is refreshing to turn to the position of

the Respondent, as explained by himself, for he repudiates them, as an honest man should and must. In his exceedingly able and scholarly defence, he met the questions presented in a frank and manly way, and did not attempt to skulk behind any cover which his counsel had set up for him, and I thank him for it. He avows his full belief in the Creed, as he interprets it, and admits that to publicly advocate doctrines repugnant to that Creed *anywhere*, or *in whatever manner*, would be a violation of his obligation.

We do not concur either in his rule of interpretation or in the soundness of his conclusions; but we *do* concede that, upon his admissions, the issue is fairly presented.

That issue is this, (and, after the discussion to which we have listened for the past two days, it is well to recall it) :—

In the years 1807 and 1808, at Andover, upon two foundations, which in the latter year were brought under the same Declaration of Faith, was established, in connection with Phillips Academy, a Theological Seminary, which has been maintained to the present time.

Intelligent, benevolent, God-fearing persons gave liberally of their substance to endow it.

They knew what they believed and intended to be taught in that Seminary.

My brother Dwight, it is true, thinks, that if they could have listened to his argument, they might have modified their views. But, unfortunately, perhaps, for them, and possibly for the world at large, they were denied that privilege, and were compelled to proceed with such assistance as was then attainable, or, in the language of that much abused phrase in the Creed so often repeated in the arguments for the defence, “according to the best light God had given them.” Their purpose was to insure the inculcation of the religious tenets which they entertained, so long as their money should be used to support the Seminary.

They therefore prescribed a Declaration of Faith, to which every professor was required to subscribe on entering office, and to repeat every five years thereafter.

With prophetic vision they looked forward to the time—possibly to this very time—when some acute lawyer should insist that the Creed which they were framing with so many prayers “smelt of antiquity,” was intended as “a clog upon instruction,” that its words were “technical and uncouth,” and its clauses “confused and contradictory,” and, therefore, that in some way it must be

brushed aside to make way for a "new departure!" It may be, even, that they anticipated the contingency that some professor in the Seminary, under the plea that he had accepted the Creed "for substance," and in a qualified sense, would claim the right to "hold and inculcate" the doctrine (or dogma) of probation after death, for example.

And, in order to guard in the most stringent manner against such a possibility, they inserted this provision immediately following the Creed:—

It is strictly and solemnly enjoined, and left in sacred charge, that every Article of the above-said Creed shall forever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, addition or diminution.

Could more vigorous language be found to express the determination on the part of the Founders that this Creed was never to be stretched nor curtailed, to admit of the teaching of any doctrines not plainly sanctioned by it!

Prof. Smyth has voluntarily taken upon himself the obligation which the Andover Creed, thus strictly guarded, imposes.

Has he fulfilled that obligation according to its true interpretation? is the grave question which you, Mr. President and Gentlemen, are now called upon to decide.

I am not, for a single moment, even suggesting bad faith, or wrong motives, on his part: our case does not require it, and, if it did, there is nothing in the evidence to justify any such imputation. That Christian charity which has not been accorded to us, we freely extend to him.

If, with the best intention, and from the purest motives, he has come short of the requirements of that obligation, in any essential particular, the charge against him is made out.

Nor will it be a sufficient answer to say, "I acted according to the best light God has given me," because what is "light" to one man may be utter darkness to another. The Founders set up in *their Creed* the beacon which they intended should illumine the path of the Seminary for all coming time. And so the question continually recurs, "*Is, or is not, the doctrine in question conformable to the Creed?*" And that is the sole test. I have said that we are bound to show a violation in some *essential particular* in order to maintain the charge. We are not here contending for non-essentials. And it is not claimed by the other side that our allegations come within that category. I need not occupy the time in citing

authorities to show with what extreme solicitude the courts seek to uphold charitable trusts, especially trusts for religious purposes. A charitable donation for religious purposes must be applied to sustain the purposes and doctrines of the donor as indicated by him. The books are full of cases to this point.

There can be no question that the Andover Founders had the right to prescribe, in the strongest terms, the conditions of this trust, and that the courts are bound to carry out those conditions "as indicated by the donors."

And it is wholly immaterial to the inquiry whether, or not, any alteration in the terms of this trust might not, under other circumstances, be expedient. Our sole duty is to ascertain the intention of the Founders, as declared by them when they established the trust, and to faithfully carry out that intention.

The claim is set up, that this was a *compromise* creed, and, therefore (this is the logic of counsel), a *contradictory* creed.

Is it conceivable, Mr. President, that Samuel Abbot, Phoebe Phillips, John Phillips, Moses Brown, William Bartlet and John Norris, deliberately adopted a creed, the sole purpose of which was to secure sound religious instruction in that Seminary so long as the sun and moon should endure, knowing that it contained doctrinal statements so utterly repugnant, one to the other, that no honest man could subscribe to them without qualification, or reservation! The idea is preposterous! As you are aware, they expressly reserved to themselves the visitorial power, which you now exercise, during their lives. Let us suppose that some Professor, who was being inducted into office in their presence, after repeating the prescribed obligations, had added, "but I wish it understood that I hold to the doctrine of probation after death, and claim the right to inculcate it, this Creed to the contrary notwithstanding!" With what consternation, think you, would such a proposition have been received by them! Now, Sir, I do not propose to enter upon the field of theological discussion by so much as a single step. Had I contemplated doing so, I should have abandoned the idea at once, after listening to the efforts in that direction of some of my legal friends on the other side! The Reverend and eminent gentlemen who are to follow me are fully competent for that work.

Nor shall I incur the risk of weakening, by dwelling upon (for no one can add emphasis to it) that admirable and conclusive argument by Prof. Park, entitled "The Associate Creed of Andover

Theological Seminary," upon which some attacks have been made by counsel for the defence.

I have been taught to love and revere that noble man from my childhood. I wish he were here in person to defend himself, which, notwithstanding his years, he is still abundantly able to do against all comers. But I put that argument against all that has been urged here in criticism of it, and confidently abide your judgment.

I desire, in conclusion, briefly to call your attention to the decision in the Norris case, (12 Mass. 546), upon which so much stress has been laid by counsel for the defence, and which they have held up to you as if it was conclusive upon this whole question. They talked so loudly and confidently about it that I began to think at one time that we should have a motion to stop these proceedings summarily upon its authority!

Let us see what that case is, and what it decides.

Mary Norris, widow of John Norris, one of the Associate Founders, by her last will, executed Mch. 21, 1811, gave a legacy of thirty thousand dollars to the Trustees of Phillips Academy, stipulating that it should enure particularly and exclusively to that part of the Theological Institution called the "Associate Foundation," so far as it might be consistent with the constitution of the Associates of that Institution.

The payment of this legacy was resisted by the executor, the chief objections being,

1. That a corporation cannot take and hold property as a trustee; and,

2. That the Trustees of the Academy could not under the Act of June, 1807, hold such a bequest unless it was consistent with the original design of the Founders of the Academy, which, it was claimed, this was not.

We are concerned only with the latter objection. And the Court held that (I quote the head-note of the case): "A liberal construction will be given by the Court to bequests for the support of Christianity; and objections drawn from technical theology will have little weight, when urged in avoidance of such bequests," a principle of law too well established for any one to call in question. The Court, having in view the importance of upholding this trust, decides that there is nothing in the terms of the bequest inconsistent with the original design of the Founders.

The language used by the learned judge who gave the opinion is

authority just so far as it was necessary to the decision of that case. Beyond that it is *obiter dictum*, and viewed in that light the case has no bearing here.

But we are met with still another ingenious, but equally untenable, proposition. This decision was rendered in 1815. Moses Brown, so say the counsel, established the Brown Professorship, which Prof. Smyth now fills, four years later, and must have done so with full knowledge of that decision. And from this you are asked to infer that he thereby signified his approval of it.

To which we answer, that the only question settled by the Norris case in which he was interested was, *whether the purpose which he had in view in founding this Professorship would be upheld by the Court*. And that question was satisfactorily answered by this case.

Still further the argument is pressed, that, because the Founders, who survived several years after Mrs. Norris's legacy had been sustained, as we have shown, nevertheless permitted to remain unchanged the original provision in their Statutes, giving an appeal to the Supreme Court from any decree of the Board of Visitors, the inference is plain, that they were willing to leave the final decision of all questions affecting this trust with that Court.

Now, in the light of the Murdock case (7 Pick. 303), which came before the court in 1829, where the opinion was rendered by Chief Justice Parker, it is difficult to see how the learned counsel can set up such a claim. That was a proceeding, on appeal to the Supreme Court "from a decree of the Board of Visitors of the Theological Institution in Phillips Academy in Andover, removing the appellant from the office of Brown Professor of ecclesiastical history in that institution."

And it was expressly held, that the Court had no power to reverse the decision of this Board *on matters of fact*, for this would be to make the Court the Visitors of the corporation, instead of the Visitors themselves appointed by the Founders; but that the authority of the Court is limited to the inquiry whether the Visitors have exceeded the limits of their jurisdiction, or have acted contrary to the statutes of the Founders. For instance, if the grounds alleged for removal are such as the statutes of the Seminary prescribe, the Court will not examine into the question whether the Visitors have erred in their conclusions from the evidence, — for that is exclusively within their jurisdiction, — but only *whether they have observed the forms of law*.

So far, then, from the inference being what it is claimed to be, it is perfectly clear that the Founders, *from the very outset*, never intended to allow, even to so exalted a tribunal as the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, the right to revise, or set aside, the decrees of this Honorable Board upon an issue like the one now pending, whether a Professor has forfeited his position by reason of "holding and inculcating" doctrines inconsistent with the Creed.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board, I have done. It has been my aim in what has been said by me to consider the question in its legal aspects only, and to answer, so far as I was able, with limited preparation, the objections raised by the learned counsel who have conducted the defence. How far I have succeeded in this purpose, you must judge. Fortunately, before such a tribunal, any shortcomings of counsel will not be permitted to endanger his cause.

We are not seeking to repress free thought, or free speech, but *to maintain Andover on the Rock where the Fathers planted her*.

The welfare of this great institution is in your keeping. — No words of mine can magnify the importance of the issue.

God give you the strength and wisdom to discharge your solemn duty in such a manner as shall do impartial and exact justice, not only to this Respondent, but, also, to that great body of the Christian public in whose affections this Institution is enshrined, and whose prayers are with you to-day, and, finally, to the blessed memory of the pious Founders of Andover Seminary.

ARGUMENT OF REV. J. W. WELLMAN, D.D.

To the Reverend and Honorable, the Board of Visitors in The Theological Seminary at Andover.

GENTLEMEN,—It devolves upon me to sustain, by evidence and argument, a part, and only a part, of the complaints, which a Committee of certain of the Alumni of the Seminary, with myself, have felt constrained to bring before you, against some of the theological beliefs and teachings of Rev. Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History in said Seminary.

It seems important to make a preliminary statement respecting the questions which we are to submit to your honorable Board. We acknowledge the supremacy, on the broad field of religious inquiry, of the question: What is the revelation which God is making to man in his Word, in Christ, in Christianity, and in his works of creation and providence? We believe in the transcendent importance of ascertaining what is true and what is false in the wide domain of religious beliefs. But here and now, in the case before you, the primary and dominant question is not whether the theology at present taught at Andover, and called the New Theology, or Progressive Orthodoxy, is true or false. Nor is it the question whether this or that Professor is a heretic as judged by some ecclesiastical standard, creed or law, or even by the common faith of the Christian Church. The chief and vital question is this: Whether the Constitution and Statutes of Andover Theological Seminary permit a man, placed as Professor upon one of its foundations and supported by its funds, to believe, maintain and inculcate what is called "The New Theology" and "Progressive Orthodoxy." This is the primary and dominating question with us, and the one which we respectfully commend to your serious consideration.

In bringing this question before you, however, we shall need

quite often to raise two other questions : First, what is the theology which the Constitution and Statutes of our Seminary require should be believed and taught by all men occupying its Chairs? In other words, what is the *Andover Theology*? Secondly, what is the Theology recently, and for the first time, maintained and inculcated by Andover Professors, and which is affirmed to be “*new*” and “*progressive*.” In other words, what is the “*New Theology*”? These two secondary questions must be constantly before us in our attempt to find a true answer to the *main* and *decisive* question, which is: Do the Constitution and Statutes of Andover Seminary permit any man, while occupying an Andover Chair and supported by Andover funds, to believe, maintain and inculcate the “*New Theology*,” or “*Progressive Orthodoxy*”?

May I add another word preliminary and personal? I am a Trustee of Andover Seminary, but I do not come before you as a representative of the Board of Trustees. I am not here by any vote or expressed wish of that Board, but solely on my own responsibility. On the 12th of January last, at a meeting of the Trustees, after presenting a paper requesting that Board to bring before the Visitors for their investigation and decision the whole question of the fact and legality of maintaining a new theology on Andover foundations, and after my request had been orally and unanimously, yet with all courtesy, refused, I said to the Trustees frankly, that I could not rest with that decision, but if any thing could be done by myself rightfully to save the Seminary to the service of the faith which it was founded to maintain, I should do it.

While, therefore, I am not here as a representative of the Board of Trustees, I am here as a Trustee, with all the responsibility of a Trustee, and in honor bound to do all I can rightfully do to save and hold the Seminary to the faith which it was founded by godly and generous men to maintain and promulgate. I stand before you, Gentlemen, under a profound conviction, that to introduce into Andover Seminary a “*New Theology*,” which is opposed to, and supplants, that which the Seminary was established to defend and teach, is a gigantic usurpation and wrong, an atrocious violation of the right and liberty of Christian men, in this free age and this free land, to use their own wealth in founding institutions of sacred learning for the purpose of disseminating the Christian faith as *they* understood it, and bringing a lost world to Christ.

We come now to the specific allegations which have been presented against some of the beliefs and teachings of Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, D.D.

I. *Our first complaint, under the fourth general division of charges, is this: that Prof. Smyth "holds, maintains and inculcates, that the Bible is not the only perfect rule of faith and practice, but is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings."*

In subscribing to the Creed of the Seminary, every Professor makes this declaration, "I believe . . . that the Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice."

For the understanding of this Creed-statement as the Founders of the Seminary understood it, a few things need to be said.

1. To the phrase, "the Word of God contained in the Scriptures," they attached a definite meaning. That meaning is not doubtful. They took the phrase from the Shorter Catechism and attached to it the same meaning which was given to it by the Westminster Assembly. That Assembly in its Larger Catechism affirms, that "Under the name of Holy Scripture, *or* the Word of God written, are now *contained* all the books of the Old and New Testament." [Chap. I. Article 2.] Then, in *their* meaning, "*all* the books of the Old and New Testament" are "the Word of God written," or "the Holy Scripture." Their statement does not allow the belief that the Scriptures "*contain*," but are *not themselves*, "the Word of God." They declare that the phrases, "Holy Scripture" and "the Word of God written" are synonymous; for they say, "Holy Scripture, *or* the Word of God written," and they affirm, that under either of these names "*are* now contained *all* the books of the Old and New Testament." In their view, then, the Bible in its *entirety* was "the Word of God," and this is what they meant by the phrase, "Word of God," when they wrote the *Shorter* Catechism.

The writers of the Andover Creed, therefore, taking the phrase, "the Word of God," from the Westminster Divines, and using it in the same sense in which *they* used it, meant by it *the Bible*, the entire Holy Scripture — comprising *all* the books of the Old and New Testaments. The Founders of the Seminary, then, could not have meant to affirm or imply, that the Word of God is found only here and there in the Bible, scattered like kernels of wheat in a heap of chaff, and that it is to be discovered only by some

ingenious sifting or winnowing process. They use the phraseology, "the Word of God contained in the Scriptures," as equivalent to, "the Word of God comprising, or constituting, the Scriptures." What they affirm in their Creed is, that the *Bible*, — not some selected books, portions, or passages of it — but *the Bible* "is the only perfect rule of faith and practice." The doctrine of the Creed therefore can properly be subscribed to, only as it is interpreted to mean what the Founders meant by it, namely, that the Bible *as a whole*, and not in some parts merely, is "the Word of God" and is "the only perfect rule of faith and practice."

2. The belief of the Founders in respect to the origin and authority of the Bible was moulded, as was that of all Calvinists, by the apostolic testimony, that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." They called the Scriptures the *Word of God*. Then they must have believed that, in *some* intelligible and real sense, they were *uttered* of God, though *written* by men. That is, they believed in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and intended that the doctrine of their inspiration should be taught in the Seminary so long as it should exist. It has been said, that the Creed "affirms no definite theory of inspiration." But it does affirm that the Scriptures are the "*Word of God*," and therefore *must* have had some *utterance* from Him. The statement of the Creed excludes the idea that they were merely human writings inspired only by human thoughts and feelings, human experiences and life. The Founders believed the apostolic testimony, that "Holy men of God spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost*;" that some *special* influence of the Holy Spirit wrought upon and guided divinely appointed men in the work of communicating God's will and truth to the world, and that this divine influence was bestowed, whether that communication were to be made on the part of inspired men *orally or by writing*, and that this special influence or inspiration was such as the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to no other men. They *did* believe that the Holy Scriptures were the Word of God, and not merely the Word of man; that they were the Word of God *written by men especially appointed and moved* to the writing, and guided therein, by the Holy Ghost. In view of all this, we affirm that no man can consistently or rightfully subscribe to the Andover Creed and then believe and maintain that the Scriptures were *not* inspired by any special and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, but were

inspired only by the religious feelings and experiences, the inner light and life of good men, or were merely the natural outcome of facts or forces in human history.

The Founders of the Seminary, of course, knew that certain minor changes, marvellously few, had crept into the text of the Bible, through transcription, translation, marginal notes, and the like. But when they spoke of the Scriptures as "the Word of God *written*," they meant *written by inspired men*. "The Word of God written" was to them His Word as it came from the hands of the men whom the Holy Ghost had moved to write it. *That* Word of God they believed to be *perfect* as "a rule of faith and practice," infallible in its moral and religious teachings, and the *only* perfect standard and infallible guide man has, by which to order his moral conduct and religious beliefs. The Founders were Calvinists and "consistent Calvinists," and one of their most sacred and tenderly guarded faiths was that the Word of God, the Bible, is entirely trustworthy in all the instructions and revelations which it was designed, of its infinite Author, to give to men.

What now are the teachings and belief of the Respondent respecting the trustworthiness of the Bible, as they are presented, not in occasional and brief utterances, but in carefully prepared and protracted discussions?

In his official response to recent communications from your Board, and repeatedly on public occasions, he has denied our allegation. It devolves upon us to sustain our charge.

In the *Andover Review*, April, 1886, one of the editors of which is Professor Egbert C. Smyth, is an editorial Article, entitled; "*The Bible a Theme for the Pulpit*." [pp. 406-409.] The entire Article is commended to the careful examination of your Honorable Board. Special attention is called to the following extracts.

The conception of the Scriptures associated with modern Biblical culture suggests a new task for the pulpit, and in making this suggestion presents a practical problem to the preacher.

On the one hand, the stimulus and comfort which he receives from his new notion of the Bible make him eager to see it taking possession of the mind of his people. . . .

On the other hand, the minister knows that his conception of the Bible differs considerably from that which holds some, perhaps many, of his people, and those by no means the least vigorous or earnest among them. And he apprehends that the divergence of his view from theirs, if clearly seen by them, would seem greater and more serious to them than it does to him.

The idea of divine revelation is in their minds so firmly associated with that of immediate divine utterance, perfect both in content and in form, that any attempt to show that the Bible is not a book of oracles would, he thinks, be likely to wound religious feeling.

Therefore, he asks himself whether it be worth while to risk the loss of influence with some, perhaps among the most valuable members of his congregation, which would be likely to result from an attempt to teach a way of looking at Scripture which would seem to them prejudicial to its sacredness and authority. . . .

It is not, we trust, disrespectful to suggest that the considerations in favor of the prudential course are newer than those which support its opposite, and therefore likely to assume excessive prominence, and that they are supported by motives which might exaggerate their importance to any but the most disinterested among mankind. [pp. 406-7.]

It is due, we may say in passing, in no small degree to the exclusion of this topic from recent preaching, that our churches have almost without exception in their Sunday school work fallen under the rigid dominion of a conception of Scripture and method of handling it with which the more intelligent ministers have only partial sympathy, and from whose grasp many of them would gladly escape. The considerations against discussing the Bible in the pulpit must be weighty to offset these reasons for frank and open speech. . . . There may, indeed, well be a time of reflection and sifting, a time of reticence because of partial or immature conviction. But when conviction is formed, it should be expressed, though not, of course, in a challenging and combative manner. A minister who should begin to preach a series of sermons about the Bible, by saying that he expected to show that the notion of inspiration in which his hearers had been trained was an erroneous one, would probably find a considerable part of his congregation resolutely opposed to his teaching from the outset. . . . But let the discussion be announced to be, what it really is, an examination of facts; let it be proposed to enter into an historical inquiry as to the genesis of the Scriptures, and to examine their relation to the divine revelation in the light of their origin, and assent is not likely to be withheld from a proposition so reasonable and so promising of definite result. Then, as inspired life is shown expressing itself in inspired teaching, — as for example, the connection between Paul's written teaching and his own inner life and his apostolic work is traced, or the apostolic tradition is shown embodying itself in the synoptic Gospels, — the conviction will gradually be created that the Scripture is the vehicle by which the divine revelation is conveyed to man, and in no true sense the revelation itself. This conviction formed, it will be easy to show that the perfection of the vehicle is by no means implied in the preciousness of its contents, and that Christian faith is not necessarily committed to the infallibility of the Bible. [pp. 408-9.]

Several things in this remarkable editorial should be especially noticed.

1. The Editor, while writing this article for the benefit of a class of ministers alleged to hold a certain extraordinary view of the Bible, represents himself as in profound sympathy with them and

with their view. More than this, from the purpose and tone of the editorial it is plain that the writer himself heartily accepts the "new notion of the Bible," "the conception of the Scriptures associated with modern Biblical culture," held by those ministers. A *new* idea it is of the Word of God; and one, therefore, not recognized by any of our church creeds, nor by the Andover Creed, nor by any creed found in the great history of Christianity, — a *new idea of the Word of God*, for the dawning of which the Christian Church has been waiting for nearly nineteen centuries.

2. Secondly, the writer fully accords with these ministers in their high estimate of the *value* of this "new notion of the Bible." He gladly represents that it has been "a stimulus and comfort" to them, and helpful in many particulars, especially in freeing them from "painful questions" respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures. Evidently the new view of Scripture has been equally helpful to himself.

3. Thirdly, the Editor is in painful sympathy with these ministers in their dread apprehension, that the new view of Scripture accepted by them, if known to their people, especially if announced to them too abruptly or inconsiderately, would be extremely offensive to them, would wound religious feeling, and would disturb, perhaps terminate, pastoral relations with some of the most vigorous and earnest, most valuable and influential members of their congregations.

4. Yet fourthly, so in earnest is the Professor to have this "new notion of the Bible" promulgated, that he urges these ministers to have the courage of their convictions, to scrutinize the motives that plead for continued silence and not yield to them too readily, to deliberate, if need be, until the new idea of the Word of God is fully matured, but *then* to show their mettle, and not play the coward. He even goes so far as to suggest continuous and judicious methods of procedure, which may be adopted by them when they shall take up the extremely difficult task of preaching a view of the Bible so startling to the people, and so hazardous to pastoral interests and relations, as this is known to be.

Now what *is* this "new notion of the Bible," so repulsive to our churches, yet so warmly advocated by the Respondent, and which he would have ministers preach even at the risk of jeopardizing, if not terminating, pastoral relations? No elaborate statement of it is found in this editorial. The writer puts in practice

the prudential counsel which he gives to timid ministers. He makes a cautious beginning, yet gives us a clear glimpse of his new conception. The conception is this: "*That the Scripture is the vehicle by which the divine revelation is conveyed to man, and in no true sense the revelation itself,*" "*that the perfection of the vehicle is by no means implied in the preciousness of its contents; and that Christian faith is not necessarily committed to the infallibility of the Bible.*" Now if this be a prudent, cautious and merely tentative statement of the "*new notion,*" we cannot help asking, what would a bold, frank and full statement of it be?

But, taking the description given us, what *is* this *vehicle*, the perfection of which is not implied by any value which may attach to the divine revelation which it conveys? This vehicle is the *Bible* itself, the *Holy Scriptures*, the very *Word of God*, which the Andover Creed declares to be "*the only perfect rule of faith and practice.*" What is that something, to the infallibility of which Christian faith is not necessarily committed? It is the same *Bible*, the *Holy Scriptures*, the *Word of God*, declared in the Creed to be "*the only perfect rule of faith and practice.*" But the statement of the Creed does not allow the illustration of a vehicle and its contents. The Scriptures a vehicle! Can a *vehicle* be a *rule* of faith and practice? According to the Creed, the *Word of God written* is not an imperfect and dilapidated carriage, the *unwritten* contents of which are the perfect rule. But the *written Word of God itself* is the perfect rule. Nor can *any* distinction which the Professor may make between "*the Holy Scriptures*" and "*the divine revelation,*" be any defence for his believing and teaching, while occupying an Andover chair, that the *Holy Scriptures* are *fallible*, but the *revelation* made in them *infallible*. An organic law of the Seminary requires that every Professor on its foundations shall believe and teach, — not that some unwritten revelation, which can be conceived of as distinct from the Scriptures and can be separated from them, is the "*perfect rule,*" — but that the Scriptures *themselves* are "*the perfect rule.*"

Can one believe that the Bible is *fallible*, and at the same time believe that it is an *infallible* rule of faith and practice? An Andover Professor can do many things, but he cannot do that. A fallible Bible is a fallible rule of faith and practice, and therefore untrustworthy in its moral and religious teachings.

The writer of the editorial before us teaches, — and he would have all ministers teach, — that "Christian faith is not necessarily

committed to the infallibility of the Bible." Then, in his view, the Bible *may* be *fallible*. But if it *is* fallible, it is fallible as a "rule of faith and practice," and as a fallible rule, is not trustworthy in its revelations and teachings. The Professor has thus brought himself into open antagonism to the Seminary Creed, in subscribing to which he declared it to be his positive belief, that the Bible is *not* a *fallible*, but a *perfect*, rule of faith and practice.

Moreover, in assenting to the Creed, the Professor announces himself as the friend and advocate of the *old* doctrine of the Catechism concerning the Scriptures; but in his editorial he announces himself as the friend and advocate of "a *new* notion of the Bible." In the latter advocacy he claims to be progressive, and to be helping forward a new and grand theological movement. But is this theological movement, to which he has so zealously committed himself, and is attempting to commit the Seminary, in harmony with the Andover Creed, or in conflict with it?

Let us see. The old doctrine is, that the Bible is a *perfect* rule of faith and practice; the "new notion" is, that the Bible is an *imperfect vehicle of truth*. The old doctrine is, that the Scriptures are *infallible* as a rule of religious belief and moral life; the "new notion" is, that "Christian faith is *not necessarily committed* to the *infallibility* of the Bible." The grand old doctrine of the Catechism and of the Creed is, that "the Word of God written" is itself *infallible* and *perfectly trustworthy* in its moral and religious teachings. "The new notion" of Progressive Orthodoxy is, that the "Word of God written" is *fallible* and *untrustworthy* in its moral and religious instruction.

We have two more complaints to bring against this editorial, entitled, "*The Bible a Theme for the Pulpit*."

1. The whole drift or tone of the Article cast suspicion upon the Bible. The Article *insinuates*, no one knows how much fallibility. A "new notion of the Bible" in this nineteenth century of the Christian Era is advocated, but what *is* "the new notion"? The Scriptures are only "a *vehicle*" of truth, and not surely perfect at that; but how dilapidated are they? How much revelation has dropped out of them, and been lost? "Christian faith is not necessarily committed to the infallibility of the Bible." But how fallible is the Bible? What *portion* of its promises and revelations can be trusted? What *is* Christian faith committed to in respect to the Bible? For aught that is said in this Article, ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Bible may be false and deceptive. And all

this needless suspicion against the Scriptures is sent forth from *Andover Seminary*, the faith of every one of whose Professors is *necessarily*, or by the organic laws of the Seminary, committed to the infallibility of the Bible as "a rule of faith and practice."

2. This Editorial Article shows, that Progressive Orthodoxy intends to crowd upon the churches, through recent graduates of the Seminary in their pulpits, *new notions* of the Bible, — notions which, it is confessed, will be extremely odious to many Christians, and are fitted to create divisions and animosities in Christian brotherhoods, and to jeopardize pastoral relations. We complain of such action and influence as an open violation of that solemn promise made by every Professor, when he says, in taking the Creed: "I will consult the good of this Institution, and the peace of the Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ on all occasions."

Again, in the book entitled *Progressive Orthodoxy*, comprising several editorials taken from the *Andover Review*, for which editorial and book, Professor Smyth, as one of the editors and authors, is responsible, we find [p. 231] the following paragraph.

If Christ is the supreme and final revelation He is the test of all preceding revelation. If we accept Him as God's supreme and final revelation, we must bring preceding revelation to this test. We cannot escape the comparison if we would. He brings us his own conception of God, of life, of duty. It claims to cover the whole horizon of truth, and demands possession of every spiritual and rational faculty. If we will have it as ours we must hold it separate from and above every other. Whatever else comes to us as from God must present its credentials to Christ's truth in our mind and hearts. This is not only the teaching of Christian faith; it is the teaching of Christ. When He told us that certain precepts of the law were to be replaced by spiritual maxims more in harmony with the nature of God, He taught us to apply Christian principles to all the law and prophets, and to regard all in them which is not consistent with those principles as superseded by the new revelation.

Now how does this extract sustain our allegation?

1. First, in these statements the Respondent represents it as his belief, that Christ himself, in his own personality, is the supreme and final revelation, and as such is the test of all preceding revelation, and not only of that, but of *all* revelations; for he adds, that if we would have Christ's conception of God, of life, of duty ours, "we must hold it separate from and above *every* other." No other revelation of God, then, though made by the Holy Spirit of God himself, who is called "the Spirit of truth," can be held by us as even co-ordinate in authority with the revelation made in the person

of Christ. Surely such depreciation as this of the Holy Spirit of God does not prepare the way for the belief that the Scriptures inspired of the Holy Spirit are "the only perfect rule of faith and practice."

2. But, secondly, the Editor also affirms, that "Whatever else comes to us as from God must present its credentials to Christ's truth." If that be so, a question of supreme practical concern to us, and to Andover Seminary, presents itself at once; *Where* is "Christ's truth" to be found? *Where*, in the judgment of *Progressive Orthodoxy*, shall we look for it? In the gospel of Christ as given us by the inspired Evangelists? Not at all. In any Word of God coming to us through man moved by the Holy Ghost to speak and write? By no means. Where then *is* Christ's truth to be found: *that* truth to which all other revelations coming to us as from God must bring their credentials? Christ's truth, that imperial and supreme truth which is to be the final test of all other revelations, is to be found "*in our mind and hearts.*" So says *Progressive Orthodoxy*.

But even then, who is to decide what "Christ's truth in our mind and hearts" is? And who is to put it into statement? We ourselves, of course. No finite being can enter into our souls to determine what truths are there, or to formulate them. Moreover, who is to compare other alleged revelations from God *with* Christ's truth in our mind and hearts? Who is to examine their credentials, who conduct the judicial trial, and who pronounce the final sentence? Certainly we ourselves. No other human being can enter this imperial court of "our mind and hearts," and sit upon its judgment seat. I submit, Gentlemen of the Board, that this new method of judging Scripture and attaining divine truth, is simply the old and erroneous notion of "the inner light" held by the Friends, which is that "a portion of the same Spirit which Jesus and the Prophets and the apostles had," or a certain inner light or life, is given to *us* as "a primary and infallible guide. Hence the Scriptures are a subordinate and secondary guide." [*Portraiture of Quakerism*, by Clarkson, vol. 2, p. 130.] According to this view the Scriptures themselves and their divine authority are to be tested by every one's own spiritual endowment and perception. [*Ibid.*, p. 113.]

Progressive Orthodoxy sometimes designates this inner and final test of Scripture by the more modern names of "Christian consciousness," "refined Christian sentiment," and "Christian culture."

3. The representation is made in this passage that Christ corrected the ancient Scriptures, replacing certain precepts of the law by "maxims more in harmony with the nature of God." Also on p. 218, the writer speaks of "teachings" of Christ, "in which He criticises and amends certain statements of the Old Testament as to men's moral obligation." But if the moral teachings of the Old Testament were so incorrect in Christ's time that they needed to be amended, one thing is certain, and that is, that those ancient Scriptures were not *then*, and are not *now*, "*a perfect rule of faith and practice*;" and no man can believe that Christ thus amended and superseded them, and at the same time believe that they *are* "*a perfect rule of faith and practice*."

Moreover, we are told, in one of those passages just cited, that Christ teaches *us* to amend and supplant the law and the prophets, so far as we find that, in our judgment, they are contrary to Christian principles. But if Christ did this, then, not only are the Old Testament Scriptures untrustworthy in their moral and religious teachings, but any man, deeming himself a judge of Christian principles, may change the Word of God, and supersede its commands, promises and revelations, by his own wisdom, *ad libitum*.

The relation of that view to the intentions of the Founders, as expressed in their Creed, is unmistakable. It is intensely antagonistic to the Andover Symbol. Few forms of unbelief in respect to the Scriptures could be more so. If the method adopted by *Progressive Orthodoxy* of testing the truth and authority of all alleged revelations from God, be the true one, then the Holy Scriptures are not "*the only perfect rule of faith and practice*." There is another rule, not simply co-ordinate with, but superior to, that of the Scriptures. That superior rule is *within ourselves*, "Christ's own truth in our mind and hearts," that is, our own "Christian consciousness," our own "refined Christian sentiment," our own "Christian culture." To the supremacy of this *rule within us*, the "Word of God written," all revelations coming to us as from God in the Old or New Testament, must bow down, present their credentials and receive judgment. We ourselves are to amend or supersede any Scripture according to our own judgment, so far as we deem our own judgment *Christian, refined, or cultured*. In other words, every man is to make his own Bible.

Now we affirm that the Professor by maintaining and inculcating these views, violates the Constitution and Statutes of the

Seminary, defeats so far the purpose of its Founders, and breaks his own solemn promises made when he subscribed to the Creed. His offence is also greatly aggravated by the further representation made in this same extract, that Christ himself teaches, that *we* may follow his example, and even take his place, in testing and winnowing the Holy Scriptures; that we ourselves by applying Christian principles may judge the law and prophets, and may "regard all in them which is not consistent with those principles as superseded by the new revelation." How is it possible for one, who thus subordinates the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures to the truth and authority of his own judgment, to believe that those same dishonored Scriptures are "the *only* perfect rule of faith and practice"?

Let it be understood, however, that whenever we speak, as we just have spoken, of a promise not kept or broken, we make no charge of conscious moral dereliction. We have no right to judge motives. What we say is, that such was the promise of the Professor, and that such was his action in relation to that promise, and that, in our judgment, the action was a violation of the promise; but we do not charge that the Professor in his own view violated his promise.

Another statement of *Progressive Orthodoxy* respecting Holy Scriptures and our Lord's relation to them, is as follows.

[*Prog. Orth.* 227-8]:—

Even if one is convinced that our Lord accepted the traditional view of the authorship of the books in question [the Pentateuch] he cannot hold that His authority is committed to that view until he has satisfied himself that Christ claimed to be omniscient during the days of his humiliation, — a belief irreconcilable with his own declaration that He knew neither the day nor the hour of his second coming.

The reasoning in this statement is abstruse, but one thing is made plain, and that is, that our Lord in the days of his humiliation did not, in the writer's view, claim to be omniscient. Then, in the writer's view, He was *not* omniscient. Would any intelligent man, who believed that Christ, in his earthly life, *was omniscient*, magnify in this way the difficulty of satisfying one's self that Christ claimed to be omniscient? It is pertinent, then, to ask:

First, how can the writer consistently represent on one page, that Christ was the supreme and final revelation, and on another page, near by, that He was so limited in his knowledge that He did not know, and could not know, who wrote the Pentateuch?

Secondly, how can the author reconcile his declaration, that Christ's "conception," or knowledge, claims to cover "the whole horizon of truth" [p. 231] with his other virtual declaration, that Christ did not claim to be omniscient?

Thirdly, if Christ in His earthly life, was a being of such limited knowledge, what certainty have we, that the revelations, and promises of His gospel made in His own name and by His own authority, are trustworthy, or that all our hopes for eternity, built upon His word, are not false and delusive?

Fourthly, if Christ was so ignorant in the days of His humiliation, that He had no exhaustive knowledge of the origin and authorship of the Old Testament Scriptures, what confidence can we have, that the teachings of those whom He instructed, or the preaching and writings of the Apostles, were, in all respects, true and of divine authority?

And fifthly, if the writer believes, as he evidently does, that our Lord Jesus Christ was a being of limited knowledge when He gave His gospel to the world, and when He instructed His Apostles who were to write so large a portion of the Bible, how can it be believed by him that the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, are "a perfect rule of faith and practice"?

Your attention is called to further statements of *Progressive Orthodoxy*.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 208]:—

We can hardly believe, indeed, that the truth as revealed through the apostles had such absolute purity as we must suppose it to have had if perfect beings had been the media of revelation.

In these words the Professor confesses his own disbelief in the absolute purity of the *truth as revealed* through the apostles; and also dishonors the Holy Spirit by implying, first, that He lacked the power to reveal perfectly the will and truth of God through inspired men; and by implying, secondly, that the degree of purity to be obtained in the truth revealed depended more upon the character of the apostles, than upon the resources of wisdom and power possessed by the Holy Ghost.

Upon the next page we find this passage [*Prog. Orth.* 209]:—

The views of Christ and of His truth contained in the apostolic Epistles must, from the nature of the case, always shape the religious and moral conceptions of the church. Not that they alone possessed the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. He is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in every soul in

which He dwells, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic into which He has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries.

The representations in this passage which sustain our complaint are :

First, that the Holy Spirit of *revelation*, — not simply of wisdom, but of *revelation* — has been given to men in ages since the apostolic ; in other words, that the apostles, as endowed by the Holy Ghost with the power to bring revelations of God's will and truth to the world, have not been the only men of their class in the history of the Christian Church.

Secondly, that those in the Christian ages since the apostolic, who have been possessed of the Spirit of revelation, or whom the Holy Spirit has qualified to make divine revelations to men, have *not been few in number*. The belief announced is, that the Holy Spirit is "the Spirit of *revelation* in *every* soul in which He dwells."

Thirdly, that some Christian men, living since the New Testament canon was closed, have been so filled by the Holy Ghost with the power and grace of *revelation*, that they nearly attained the position and authority of the apostles themselves. For what more, indeed, can be said of the apostles, than that the *Holy Spirit of revelation* "so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth into their souls that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries" ?

Now if the Professor believes, — as he certainly does if he accepts *Progressive Orthodoxy*, — that the apostles, as endowed by the Holy Spirit to make revelations of God's will and truth to the world, have been succeeded by men in large numbers, to whom the same Holy Spirit has given the same endowment *in kind*, and by *some* men to whom the same Holy Spirit has given the same endowment, not only *in kind*, but also in such large *degree* that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries, then how can said Professor subscribe to the Andover Creed, and solemnly say, "I believe that the Word of God contained in the *Scriptures of the Old and New Testament* is the *ONLY perfect* rule of faith and practice" ? If the Holy Spirit is believed to be the Spirit of *revelation* in every soul in which He dwells, the Professor, in consistency, must believe also that there *may* be Christian writings which stand on a level with those of the apostles.

We need now to raise more distinctly the question, What, according to *Progressive Orthodoxy*, is the true theory of the genesis of the Bible?

1. First, it teaches that the Word of God comprising the Scriptures is largely the product of historical facts and forces. It is affirmed to be the declaration of Christian faith, "that if the forces visible in sacred history appear to the best human vision to have produced the Bible, God must have wished men to believe that they did produce it." [*Prog. Orth.* 194-5.]

Progressive Orthodoxy also expresses itself in the following language [*Prog. Orth.* p. 194]:—

Possibly, however, some may think that we have no right to assume that the antecedent *facts* fully account for the Bible, since, although it is unquestionably to a certain extent their product, a special operation of Almighty power, of which we are not informed, may have given to it its highest qualities. But surely in the absence of a clear revelation that such special divine power was employed, we have no right to assert its exercise. If without its use the Bible, as it stands, can be accounted for, it becomes unnecessary.

Several things in this passage should be distinctly noticed.

First, the idea of any special operation of Almighty power in producing the Bible, or in giving it its highest qualities, is discarded.

Secondly, it is stated, that we are not informed of any such special operation of divine power in the production of the Bible.

Thirdly, it is implied that antecedent historical *facts*, are sufficient to account for the Bible without the aid of any such special divine power.

How, then, we ask, can the same man who makes these representations, affirm it to be his belief, as he does in subscribing to the Creed, that the Bible is the *Word of God*?

Prof. Smyth is on the Associate Foundation. The Associate Founders were Hopkinsians. To show how far removed the Professor's views of the holy Scriptures are from those of the Founders, I give a few sentences from Dr. Samuel Hopkins himself.

"It is as really impossible," he wrote, "that any uninspired man or number of men . . . should make the writings which we find in the Bible, as it is for them to contrive and make the visible world; and we have as satisfactory evidence that the Scriptures, contained in the Bible, were written by the inspiration of God, as we have that the sun, moon and stars, and all the visible world were made by him." [*Hopkins' Works* vol. iii. p. 699.]

But, secondly, *Progressive Orthodoxy* holds, not only that the Holy Scriptures are largely the product of "facts and of forces visible in sacred history," but also that the sacred writers produced them out of their own spiritual life, their own religious experience. The representation is repeatedly made that the writers of the Bible were favored with no special or unique influence of the Holy Spirit to aid them in writing the Word of God, but that all their words and deeds, their teaching, preaching and writing, their entire outward life, sprung from a common source, namely, their own spiritual or religious experience. In the case of the apostles, for example, out of their own "quickened and mightily invigorated life leaped" their "new deeds of heroic devotion" [p. 200]. From the same source came also all their *writings*. The apostolic Scriptures were simply the natural product of the Christian experience, feeling and sentiment existing in the hearts of the apostolic writers. *Progressive Orthodoxy* affirms [pp. 196, 198, 202, 222] that :

"There is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as soon as they sat down to write, and that, in consequence, what they wrote had a different quality from what they said. . . . The assumption," we are informed, "of a special activity of the divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching, is a most fruitful source of confusion in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is. It is insisted not only that there is no evidence of such an act, but that the supposition of its existence is contrary to the facts which lie on the face of the Scriptures. . . . It is pure scholasticism," we are told, "to try to find an explanation of the fifty-first Psalm in any other thing than the heart whose penitence pulses through it. . . . We are finding out, says *Progressive Orthodoxy*, that the seat of the prophetic teaching was the moral and religious nature of the inspired seer alone."

Again we have these declarations [pp. 201, 202] :

Paul says that the revelation of Christ, which was the source of his preaching, and the ground of its authority, was given in his conversion. . . . The light into which he was born was that from which he taught. . . . In saying that the apostolic teaching is the expression of the spiritual life of its authors, and wears the impress of their respective personalities, we do not take one jot or tittle from its sacredness as a revelation."

These citations teach, with emphasis,

1. That all special and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit upon the Sacred Writers to aid them in writing the Word of God was withheld.

2. That the apostolic teaching was simply the expression of the spiritual life of its authors.

3. That the source of the prophetic teaching was "the moral and religious *nature*" of the prophet alone.

4. That it is the purest scholasticism to believe that the Holy Spirit exerted any immediate, special and direct influence upon the mind and heart of the writer of the fifty-first Psalm to aid him in the composition of that immortal Scripture.

5. That it is a most fruitful source of confusion in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is, to believe, as the Founders of Andover Seminary did, the apostolic testimony, that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

6. That it is a mere *assumption*, that there was any "special activity of the divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching."

7. That "there is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as soon as they sat down to write, and that in consequence, what they *wrote* had a different quality from what they *said*."

But why, we ask in reply, is this last representation so repeatedly made and insisted upon? For the "Progressive" Divine does not himself believe that there is a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation when they rose up to *speake* God's truth. He does not believe that "Holy men of God *spake* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but that they spoke and wrote, and ordered all their outward conduct, as they were moved by historic facts and forces, and by their inner light and life.

It is the common Christian belief, that the apostles were inspired *both* to preach and to write God's truth. *Progressive Orthodoxy* holds, that the inner, spiritual life of an apostle inspired alike his right and noble conduct, and the Scripture he wrote. But every apostle's conduct was not always right and noble. Peter "*dissembled*," so that Paul rebuked him sharply. Peter's inner life did *not* keep him from wrong action. How, then, do we know it kept him from wrong writing? If it allowed him to dissemble in his dealing with his friends, how do we know that it did not allow him to dissemble, or in some other way to fail of writing the truth, when he wrote those passages in his First Epistle, upon which

Progressive Orthodoxy founds its stupendous dogma that the vastest and grandest missionary fields under the gospel of Christ are not, and never have been, in this world, *but are in Hades?* And Peter was by no means the only sacred writer, whose outward conduct was not right. Now we press the question; if this inner, spiritual life was the sole source, alike of their outward conduct, and their writings, and their conduct was imperfect, what assurance have we that the Scriptures which they gave to the world were not imperfect also?

Our objection to this theory, as one to be held and taught in an Andover chair, is, that it is utterly out of sympathy with, and repugnant to, the traditions, the Spirit and the Creed of the Seminary. The Creed declares the Scriptures to be "The Word of God;" but according to this new theory, they would more properly be called, "The Word of the spiritual man." The Creed honors the Scriptures; this new theory depreciates them by describing them as having the same genesis as the writings of any spiritually minded person—for the Holy Spirit is declared to be the Spirit of revelation in every Christian. The Professor indeed says, that "The apostles were the bearers of a revelation made immediately to each of them by the Spirit of God" [p. 200]. That sounds well. But according to this new theory, the very *same* can be said of *any* Christian man, for this gift of revelation is a part of *every* Christian's spiritual life. Indeed, it is stated [p. 201], that, "The revelation of which each apostle was the bearer is not, therefore, to be thought of as a set of religious ideas made over to him to be held as an external possession. . . . For it was in essence a personal experience of Jesus Christ in and through whom he lived."

Consequently we find in this new theology no doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible. The common view of the origin of the Bible is vigorously and repeatedly rejected. Not only is no definition of inspiration given, but it is asserted that "such a definition is not needed to explain sacred Scripture" [p. 232]. "We have never seen," says the Respondent, "a definition of inspiration which was rooted in the realities of sacred history" [p. 232]. Yet this same writer gives a definition of the Bible,—one designed apparently to supersede all the inadequate definitions and common ideas of inspiration, and to impart to students and others such a clear and illuminating conception of what the Scriptures really are, that that conception shall be to them ever after a mighty stimulus, and an unspeakably precious consolation. The definition is this: "*The*

Bible is the representation in writing of God's historical revelation of himself to man, which has come immediately from that revelation as it passed through its successive stages [*Prog. Orth.* p. 233]. We desire to treat this definition with all respect. It is the only one, it is believed, in this entire theological work. Progressive Divines are not handy at definitions, and need to be encouraged. This will do for a beginning. But, Gentlemen of the Board, we trust it is not improper to remind you, that Article XX. of the Associate Foundation, requires, that the *Visitors* shall "take care, that the duties of every Professor on this Foundation shall be intelligibly . . . discharged."

True, *Progressive Orthodoxy* speaks of adding to all the other qualifications of the apostles, "that of pre-eminent endowment of the Holy Spirit." But it must be remembered, that this same spiritual endowment is declared to be nothing different *in kind* from that which enabled the apostles to *live* "in a new and higher way" [p. 200] and nothing different *in kind* from that vouchsafed to all Christians. The inspiration, as spiritual illumination, which the apostles received to aid them in communicating, by teaching, preaching and writing, God's truth, was the same which they received when they came into a knowledge of the Christ in them. Of Paul, for instance, it is stated, that "The light into which he was born was that from which he taught" [p. 201].

In view of the written statements and representations now presented, for which Prof. Smyth is responsible, we are warranted in making the following affirmations.

1. First, the Respondent, as judged by these writings, does not believe in any inspiration of the Scriptures that has ever, to his knowledge, been defined.

2. Secondly, he does not believe that any *special* and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit was vouchsafed to the sacred writers to aid them in writing the Word of God.

3. Thirdly, he *does* believe and teach, that the Scriptures, in common with all the words and deeds, the daily life and conduct, the revelations, the teachings, and the preaching of the sacred writers, were the product of historic facts and forces, and of their own spiritual life, or religious experience.

4. Fourthly, he believes and teaches, that this spiritual life, or, in the case of the apostles, Christian experience, though coming itself in a greater or less degree from the Holy Spirit, and which enabled them to reveal God's will and truth to man, did not differ

in kind from the new and spiritual life granted to all regenerate men.

5. Fifthly, he believes and teaches, that all revelations, other than Christ himself, coming to us as from God, must present their credentials to Christ's truth in our mind and hearts.

6. Sixthly, he believes and teaches, that Christ, by his own example in amending and superseding portions of the ancient Scriptures, teaches us to do the same; that is, "to apply Christian principles to all the law and the prophets, and to regard all in them which is not consistent with those principles as superseded by the new revelation."

7. Seventhly, he holds and teaches that we can hardly believe that the truth revealed by the apostles had such absolute purity as it would have possessed, had the apostles themselves been perfect beings.

8. Eighthly, he maintains and inculcates "the new notion," that the Holy Scriptures are a *vehicle* of revelation, the perfection of which vehicle is by no means implied in the value of the revelation, and that "Christian faith is not necessarily committed to the infallibility of the Bible."

Now in respect to these views of the Bible, we submit the following declarations:

1. First, these views depreciate and dishonor the holy Scriptures, by representing that their source, which is alleged to have been the religious experience of the writers, was the same *in kind* as that of the writings of all spiritual or regenerate men.

2. Secondly, they dishonor the Holy Spirit by representing that he had not the capacity or power to communicate religious truth to the world in absolute purity through imperfect men like the prophets and apostles.

3. Thirdly, they violently antagonize the Andover Creed in various ways, as we have already shown, but especially in this, that they erect in our mind and hearts a standard of truth and faith equal or superior to that of the holy Scriptures, and thus render it impossible that the Bible should be "the *only perfect rule* of faith and practice."

4. Fourthly, these views are contrary and repugnant to Art. II. of the Statutes of the Associate Foundation. Prof. Egbert C. Smyth is placed on that Foundation. Art. II. says, that "Every Professor on the Associate Foundation shall be . . . an orthodox and consistent Calvinist." Now that terminology, "an orthodox

and consistent Calvinist," had a definite and well known meaning at the time the Seminary was founded. It meant a Calvinist of the Hopkinsian School. And it needs no argument before this Board to show that no man *can*, by any possibility, be a Calvinist of that school, and hold such views of the Bible as we have been considering.

5. Fifthly, for a Professor, on the Associate Foundation, to believe and teach such notions of the Bible renders it impossible for him to be continued on that Foundation, inasmuch as Art. III. of the Statutes of that Foundation requires, that "no man shall be continued a Professor on said Foundation, who shall not continue to approve himself a man of sound and orthodox principles in Divinity agreeably to the aforesaid Creed."

Now, Gentlemen of the Board, we ask your judgment upon the question, whether it be possible for one to be "a man of sound and orthodox principles in divinity," in the meaning and intention of the Associate Founders as expressed in their Statutes and especially in their Creed, *and yet* hold beliefs respecting the Holy Scriptures so utterly antagonistic to the Statutes and the Creed of this Foundation as are the beliefs set forth in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, and in the *Andover Review*, for which Professor Smyth is responsible.

II. *Our second particular complaint is, that Professor Egbert C. Smyth holds, maintains and inculcates, "That Christ in the days of his humiliation was a finite being, limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments; in other words was not God and Man."*

In presenting the grounds for this complaint, we first call attention to the statement of the Creed, which is; "That the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God, who for this purpose became man, and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." The Creed also affirms "that, agreeably to these Scriptures, God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power," etc.

It is clearly affirmed in these Creed-statements, that the Redeemer is "the eternal Son of God," that *He* "became man;" and that *He* "continues to be *God and man* in two distinct natures and one person forever," also that "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his . . . wisdom." It follows then, that when "the eternal Son of God" "became man, and continued in his earthly life to be *God* and man, he continued to

be *God 'infinite, eternal and unchangeable' in his being, wisdom and power.*" Accordingly, whatever he knew *before* his incarnation he knew *during* his incarnation. If, as God, he was omniscient *before* he became man, he was omniscient, as God, when, in his humanity, he continued to be "*God and man.*"

What now has been the teaching of the Respondent? On pp. 227-8 of *Progressive Orthodoxy* we find the following passage:

Even if one is convinced that our Lord accepted the traditional view of the authorship of the books in question [The Pentateuch], he cannot hold that His authority is committed to that view until he has satisfied himself that Christ claimed to be omniscient during the days of his humiliation, — a belief irreconcilable with his own declaration that He knew neither the day nor the hour of his second coming.

We have no occasion now to consider this peculiar *reasoning*, save to notice one of the remarkable assumptions in it, namely, that no one can satisfy himself that Christ claimed to be omniscient, in view of Christ's own admission, that, as the Son, he did not know the time of his second coming. Nor do we care to dwell one moment upon the equally remarkable implication, that Christ left on record no testimony other than this upon the great question of his equality with the Father, or of his true deity. But we *do* call attention to the representation made here, that no one can satisfy himself "that Christ claimed to be omniscient." Evidently the writer himself is not satisfied that Christ made this claim, and does not believe that he *is* omniscient. How, then, can that writer subscribe to the Creed and say, "I believe," that "the eternal Son of God" "became man and continues to be *God and man*"? Only as, at the same time he denies it to be his belief, that God is "infinite, eternal and *unchangeable*" "in his wisdom"? Surely, unless God *is* finite and changeable, he had all the knowledge when he was *God and man*, which He had had from all eternity, and has now.

Moreover, we submit, that no man, who really believes that Christ, in his earthly life, was "*God and man*," who is even friendly to that doctrine, and regards himself as under obligation to maintain it, would ever have attempted, in this way or in any way, to set forth the impossibility of one's believing in Christ's omniscience and deity. What would you, Gentlemen of the Board, think of the man, who professedly holding the doctrine of the deity of Christ, and under promise to inculcate it and to oppose the con-

trary belief, should attempt, in this way or in any way, to maintain the impossibility of one's believing *that same doctrine*—the very doctrine he professes to believe and has pledged himself to inculcate? Can any man rightfully hold the chair of a Professor in the Seminary at Andover, who treats in this way the doctrine of our Lord's omniscience and deity, — the doctrine of all evangelical creeds, of every "orthodox and consistent Calvinist," and of every man "of sound and orthodox principles in divinity"? Not to believe this doctrine, but to disparage it, is to believe and advocate the view that Christ was a finite being possessed neither of omniscience nor of any other infinite attribute.

One might suppose that the Respondent would explain himself by saying, that Christ as *man* was ignorant, but as *God* was omniscient; as *man* was weary and faint, but as *God* He fainted not neither was weary. But he is barred from making this explanation by his own teaching respecting the personality of Christ. "The evidences," he says, "of a complete human nature multiply as we read, but not less manifest is the one Person who is the centre to which all attributes and acts are ever referred." [*Prog. Orth.* pp. 22-3.] According to this statement, we have no right to ascribe certain works and attributes to Christ as *God*, and other works and attributes to Him as *man*. It will not do to say that Christ in his *human nature* was weary, but in his *divine nature* was unlimited in his strength. And for the same reason it is not permissible to represent that Christ as a *man* was limited in knowledge, but as *God* was unlimited. It would seem, then, that the Respondent *must* believe, that the eternal Son of God, during the days of his humiliation, was a finite being, and of course limited in all his capacities and attainments.

We cite another passage in support of our complaint [*Prog. Orth.* p. 32]:—

There was not only growth of the humanity of Jesus, but a progressive union with the divine. Here is the truth in the theories of the Kenotists, who maintain that the Word, at the Incarnation, laid aside, or suspended the exercise of, his attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and the like. This is but a clumsy and somewhat violent and unethical method of appropriating certain undeniable facts; such as the limitation of Jesus's knowledge, the perfect human reality of his earthly life, the veritable growth of his consciousness and personality from the moment of the Incarnation.

We find in this passage a distinct recognition, on the part of the writer, of *truth* in the views of the Kenotists, who maintain,

it is said, "that the Word, at the Incarnation, laid aside, or suspended the exercise of, his attributes of omniscience, omnipotence and the like." These limitations of Christ's knowledge and power, during his incarnate life, are declared by the writer to be "*undeniable facts*." The Kenotic method of *appropriating* them is criticised, but the "undeniable facts" remain all the same, and there is no recognition of any opposing facts to be accounted for.

It should also be observed, that the limitations spoken of in this passage are ascribed to the entire personality of our Lord. It is represented as an undeniable fact that there was "a veritable growth of his consciousness and personality from the moment of the Incarnation."

We see no way to interpret this passage except as an unqualified affirmation on the part of the writer of his own belief that the *one Person*, Christ, in his earthly life, was a finite being limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments, — a belief utterly irreconcilable with the statements of the Creed.

We will bring to your notice only one other extract in support of this complaint. In an editorial in the *Andover Review* [May, 1886, p. 522] it is said, that "The limitations to which his humanity subjected him are recognized; but as the glorified Christ he is delocalized, unlimited, is with his church alway unto the end of the world."

This language indicates, that in the Respondent's belief, the Son of God, when in his earthly life, was a *limited* being, possessing no infinite attribute; but when glorified was an *unlimited* being, endowed with all the infinite attributes of Deity. How a limited being could ever become an unlimited being, does not appear; but the statement seems to be — not only that such a change of the finite into the absolute was possible, but that it was actually effected.

Now in view of all these citations, the theory of the Professor appears to be, that the second Person of the Trinity, in His incarnation must have contracted himself, and during His earthly life was in a dwarfed condition, subject in the entirety of His constitution or personality to the limitations of a created being; and that, at the time of His ascension and glorification, He assumed again the absolute attributes of deity, taking with him now His humanity, and continuing to be the Son of man forever.

This is no new theory. Its absurdity, and its incongruity with facts in Christ's life and with Scriptural statements are apparent. Moreover the view is irreverent, and dishonors the Redeemer.

Students who become familiar with such representations of the ignorance, and of the limited wisdom and power, of our Lord, cannot have exalted conceptions of either his character or his teachings.

It ought not to have been surprising, that an Andover student, when under examination two or three years ago, said, in response to a question, that "no statement of Christ, no matter how positive, in affirmation of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, could now be accepted as decisive, because He was not omniscient, and especially because He was not up to present date in the higher criticism." Can it be strange, that under the influence of such representations as we have now cited, the character of God's Word, and of Christ himself, should be subject to the most irreverent handling?

We affirm therefore, that this theory of the limitations of Christ's attributes and attainments during the days of His humiliation is discordant with the spirit and traditions of Andover Seminary. It is not the belief expressed in the Creed, and which the Professor has promised to maintain and inculcate, but is irreconcilably antagonistic to that belief. Nor can any man who holds such views be "an orthodox and consistent Calvinist" according to the statutory requirement of the Associate Foundation.

III. *Our third specific complaint is, that Professor Smyth "holds, maintains and inculcates," "That no man has power or capacity to repent without knowledge of God in Christ."*

Our view is, that the Constitution and Statutes of Andover Seminary do not allow any Professor, while occupying one of its chairs, to hold or teach such a belief. Every Professor, in subscribing to the Creed, says, —

I moreover believe . . . that God's decrees perfectly consist with human liberty; God's universal agency with the agency of man; and man's dependence with his accountability; *that man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him; so that nothing, but the sinner's aversion to holiness, prevents his salvation.*

Several questions may be raised as to these statements of the Creed.

First, it speaks of *man's* agency, of *man's* dependence, and affirms that *man* has understanding and corporeal strength, but what man is referred to? Man living after the incarnation of the Word, and having knowledge of God as revealed in Christ? Cer-

tainly not. Man "*in Christ*," or "*in union*" with him, that is, the Christian man? By no means. Man *not* a Christian, yet conceived of as organically and vitally united, in common with all men, to Christ as the Head of the race? Assuredly not. That conception of the relation of Christ to the human race, the Founders of the Seminary were familiar with, and they decisively rejected it, as will be shown. By *man*, they meant *man as God made him* in his intellectual and bodily powers, *man as constitutionally* endowed by his Creator, and not as empowered *after* his natural constitution was determined and made actual. The reference of the Creed is to *man as man*—to man not as *morally*, but as *naturally* constituted and empowered at the time of his creation.

Secondly, what did the Founders mean by the declaration, that "*man has understanding . . . to do all that God requires of him*"? They meant simply that he has intellectual ability to apprehend what God commands—all mental strength needful to enable him to obey God. What they assert is that *man*, by virtue of being created as he was, has this God-given endowment of understanding—the power of understanding, and actual understanding—understanding, for instance of sin and righteousness; and if of them, then of law; and if of law, then of a Lawgiver; and if of a Lawgiver, then of personal responsibility to him; and of his own obligation to repent; then of reward and punishment. *Man as man* has understanding enough to do what God requires of *him*, so that when he has sinned, nothing but his own aversion to holiness prevents his repentance and his salvation. If at any time he does *not* act up to his understanding in doing God's will, he is without excuse, and is justly exposed to eternal condemnation. This the Professor, in taking the Creed, affirms to be his belief.

Thirdly, what did the Founders mean by the phrase "*corporeal strength*"? They meant what they said, bodily power, physical ability. Not a few of God's commands cannot be obeyed except through the powers and the strength of the body. Dr. Samuel Spring was one of the writers of the Andover Creed; and he left on record the meaning which *he* attached to the language we are now considering. "*Natural ability*," he wrote, is the intellectual and bodily strength of man to perform every action which God requires of him.

As natural ability consists in having intellectual and bodily strength to perform every action required of man, it is evident that moral ability must consist in a willing mind. [*Moral Disquisitions*, pp. 172-3.]

The meaning of the Founders, then, in this twofold statement of their Creed, is that *man* has *natural ability*, that is real and full power, to do all that God requires of him.

They also believed, and required every Professor to believe, that man is "*morally incapable* of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam," that is, that he *will* not do what he has ability to do in obeying God, or the gospel of Christ, and therefore is under righteous condemnation.

The belief, then, presented in the Andover Creed is, that man wherever found, cannot be blameworthy in not obeying God, unless he has intellectual and bodily strength to obey Him. Obligation is commensurate with ability; it can never transcend it. But man *as man* has intellectual and bodily strength, that is, real and adequate ability to do all that God requires of him. Consequently when he has sinned, he has understanding of his sin and of his ill-desert, and so is able to condemn his sin and turn from it, confess it and cry for mercy. If he does *not* do this, it is simply because he is *unwilling* to be holy. Thus it is true, that "*nothing but his own aversion to holiness prevents his salvation.*"

It should now be added, that the Founders of the Seminary regarded this doctrine of man's "natural ability," as thus stated, to be an eminent and cardinal doctrine in their Creed. The whole system of their theological belief demanded that this truth should have marked emphasis in the teachings of their Seminary. Everybody will admit this, who knows what the New England Theology is, and that the theology of the Founders, and, of course, of their Creed, was *that* Theology. Andover Seminary would never have been founded, had this one fundamental truth been excluded from the professed doctrinal basis of the Institution; for the opposite view of man's relation to the requirements of God was extremely distasteful to the Founders. No one of them was more positive or influential in the planning and establishing of the Seminary than Dr. Samuel Spring. And "he was often heard to say," as tradition tells us, "that he would sooner see the whole Seminary sunk in the depths of the ocean than have its Professors teach the doctrine of 'the sinner's inability to repent,' and the doctrine of 'the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity,' and the doctrine of 'a limited atonement.'"

This tradition is doubtless believed even by Dr. D. T. Fiske, now President of the Andover Board of Trustees; for in his pamphlet on the Andover Creed [p. 28], he cites it from *The Congregationalist* of June 21, 1850. He wrote his

pamphlet in defence and advocacy of teaching, on Andover Foundations, the New Departure doctrines, one of which, as we shall show, is, that man of himself has *not* the ability to do all that God requires of him. *How* the fact, that this view, which was so alarming and odious to one of the Founders of the Seminary, strengthened Dr. Fiske's argument in advocacy of now teaching that same odious view at Andover, it is difficult to see.

But we are not dependent upon tradition for Dr. Spring's belief and intention upon this point. In a letter to Dr. Leonard Woods, dated Aug. 1st, 1807, and published in Dr. Woods' *History of the Andover Theological Seminary* [pp. 497-8] Dr. Spring wrote as follows :

1. Is not this a fact, — that the Bible, which is the infallible guide of truth, whether we comprehend the connection or not, in all the commands it enjoins on sinners, goes manifestly on the principle that they, as we understand the doctrine of ability, in all cases, have natural ability to begin to repent or be holy ?

2. Now shall we believe this, while we theorise, or shall we disbelieve it means what it says and make the Bible bend to our theory, or shall we come to a solemn pause and query whether we do not theorise too fast ? Human reason must not make itself the standard, in opposition to the open face of Scripture. . . .

P.S. — If sinners have no ability to repent what must they do ? and what must we tell them while we use the Bible for a text-book ? . . . Are sinners who are totally depraved, i.e., destitute of holy tastes, destitute too of natural ability to repent, or to begin to be holy ? No ; for thousands of them have repented, and found that they had natural ability. . . . The sinner if not the child of fate, or a brute beast, is a moral agent, and able to begin to repent, as all the commands and penalties of the law, and all the offers and promises of the gospel, invariably presuppose. If, in one word, the sinner is unable to repent or make a new heart, the language of the Bible is absurd, and what is God, and what is accountability but a delusion ?

This testimony found in a letter written in the very year and month in which the elder Seminary was founded, — written too by a man who was second to no one in that noble band of men who, a year later organized the present Institution, is surely significant of their own interpretation of the Creed-statement now before us, and of the momentous importance they attached to the Christian doctrine which that statement expresses.

What now are the views upon this subject which are presented in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, and for which Prof. Egbert C. Smyth is responsible.

We make the following citations.

It might be enough to suggest, at this point, that the power and inclination to repent are not found except when God is revealed in Christ; that only because Christ has brought God to men in a new light are they stirred to penitence [p. 47].

Christ's power to represent or be substituted for man is always to be associated with man's power to repent. The possibility of redeeming man lies in the fact that although he is by act and inheritance a sinner, yet under the appropriate influences he is *capable* of repenting. The power of repentance remains, and to this power the gospel addresses itself. Christ suffering and sympathizing with men is able to awaken in them and express for them a real repentance. It is to this power that Christ, the holy and merciful, attaches himself. Realizing it in some, and being able to realize it in all, He represents humanity before God. Now the power of repentance, which, so far as it exists, is the power of recuperation, is superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and of present habit. It is the one fact which can never be estimated for what it may do, which baffles the calculation of the wisest observers. The penitent man, so far as he really repents, is in the exercise of a freedom which resists and almost subjugates the forces of evil. In union with Christ, who brings spiritual truth and power to man, repentance is radical. Man left to himself cannot have a repentance which sets him free from sin and death. But in Christ he is moved to repentance which is revolutionary; in Christ he can express repentance, for in union with Christ he adopts the feeling of Christ concerning sin against the God of love. If man unaided could become truly repentant, he would become holy, and would be the child of God. This was admitted by Jonathan Edwards. But it is only in Christ that he has such knowledge of God and of himself as is necessary to a repentance which is revolutionary. It is not true, we admit and insist, that repentance without Christ is availing for redemption, for man of himself cannot repent; but, on the other hand, it is not true that Christ's atonement has value without repentance. Christ's sacrifice avails with God because it is adapted to bring man to repentance. This gives it ethical meaning and value. He is one, in with the race, who has the power of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling towards God and towards sin; and so God looks on the race as having this power in Christ, a power which, when realized, melts away the iron fetters of what we call necessity and fate [pp. 54, 55, 56].

The race is reconstituted in Christ, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing powers for repentance and holiness, which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of [p. 56].

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting [p. 58].

Now we affirm that these declarations of the New Theology, upon the subject of man's ability to obey God, squarely antagonize and deny the declarations of the Creed.

1. The Creed affirms that man of himself has real and full ability to do all that God requires of him, and therefore has real and full ability *to repent*. But the New Theology affirms, that "*man of himself cannot repent*." [*Prog. Orth.* p. 55.] The antagonism thus announced is clear and absolute.

2. The Creed affirms that man *as man*, man in his *constitutional* faculties and *natural* abilities, has full power to obey God, and of course is of himself *capable* of repenting of his sins, of trusting in and obeying God. But the New Theology affirms that man has no such power and no such capability, save as he is brought under certain influences, or to speak more specifically, *save as he is empowered and moved by the sufferings and sympathies of Christ*. One statement made is this: "God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious, because Christ, laying down his life, *makes the race to its worst individual capable of repenting, obeying, trusting*." [*Prog. Orth.* p. 58.] The Creed represents that to repent and amend *is within man's power*. The New Theology affirms that to repent and amend *is beyond man's power*. The Creed declares that man *as man*, man as originally formed and endowed by his Creator and as now existing, is *capable* of repenting of his sins and trusting in God. The New Theology affirms that man has this capability *only* as Christ through the sacrifice of himself *makes him capable*. Men are utterly powerless to do God's will until "Christ laying down his life, *makes the race to its worst individual capable of repenting, obeying, trusting*." Here again the antagonism between the two theologies is unqualified and intense.

3. The Creed affirms that sinful man has real and complete power to repent of his sins, and that repentance is one of the "personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation," that is, is one of the prescribed conditions upon the fulfilment of which the sinner is set free from sin and death, receiving forgiveness and the life everlasting through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The New Theology affirms that, "Man left to himself cannot have a repentance which sets him free from sin and death." [*Prog. Orth.* p. 55.] The Creed does not admit that repentance avails for salvation without Christ's atonement, but it does affirm that man of himself *can* repent, *can* trust, and *can* do whatever God requires of him, and that upon his doing these things he is freed from sin and death by God himself; not through magic, but through the vicarious sac-

rifice of the Lamb of God "slain from the foundation of the world." The New Theology affirms that man of himself cannot repent, cannot trust, and so cannot of himself do those things which God requires him to do, and which he *must* do in order that he may be saved through Christ. On this point also the two theologies are irreconcilably antagonistic the one to the other.

4. The Creed represents that sinful man has in himself not only *power*, but also *motive*, to repent. His understanding of his sins is a *motive* to repentance. Even if he is without the written law of God, the law is lettered on his heart, and he knows the works which are required of him. He does not sin without knowing his guilt. He is so made that he cannot but know it. And all this knowledge presses him to turn from his sin. His own conscience, memory and reason plead with him to repent. The sense of ill-desert, some vision of righteousness and of its rewards, consciousness of present condemnation under law, fear, forebodings, and even remorse — all these things are motives urging him to repentance; and under them he *can* repent if he will. If he does not, it is because he *will* not. He is without excuse, and his *impenitence* is a *sin*. If the Holy Spirit moves upon him, and Christ comes to him in the gospel, they come not to give him one new faculty or power, or any new ability whatever to repent, but simply to remove his *unwillingness*. They present, indeed, new motives, — motives of transcendent reach and power, — but they do not confer the *least* natural or real ability to repent. The only obstacle they seek to remove is the sinner's *aversion* to repentance and holiness, for, according to the Creed, this is the *only* obstacle to the sinner's salvation. All these interpositions of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, are of *grace*. They are not *due* to the sinner. He cannot demand them as his right. They constitute the undeserved redemption that comes of God's infinite and gracious compassion. Such is the theology of the Creed.

But the New Theology affirms, that sinful man has neither *power* nor inclination to repent, *save as he is empowered and moved by forces and motives from without himself*. It is stated [*Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 47], "that the *power and inclination* to repent are not found except when God is revealed in Christ; that *only* because Christ has brought God to men in a new light are they stirred to repentance." According to this view, the sinner has not only no inclination, or willingness, but no *power*, to repent, until God is revealed to him in Christ. Therefore, if he does *not*

know God in Christ, he is under no obligation to repent, and impenitence with him is not a sin. Moreover, if God requires him to repent, as he does, He is bound to give to him, *as his due*, the power to repent. But He gives this power, according to the New Theology, by giving his Son that he may, by the incarnation, come into organic and vital relation to the race. The Son, by *coming into union* with the race and revealing the Father, imparts the power to repent. But if man is utterly unable to repent, and yet is required of God to repent, the bestowal of the power to meet the requirement is *due* to man, and God by giving his Son to impart this power to him was simply meeting an obligation. Therefore the gift of his Son was not of grace but of debt. How *abhorrent* all this is to the Theology which Andover Seminary was founded to teach is made evident by the single emphatic statement of the Creed, "that our salvation is *wholly* of grace."

5. The Creed affirms, that "nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation." This declaration is made in connection with the statement of man's ability to obey God in all things, and as legitimately following that statement. "Man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him; *so that nothing, but the sinner's aversion to holiness, prevents his salvation.*"

But the New Theology teaches, that the sinner's "aversion to holiness" is *not* the only thing that prevents his salvation. His real and utter powerlessness to repent, prevents his salvation. And as the needed power can be imparted to him only through his knowing God in Christ, it follows that if he does not thus know him, the *lack of that knowledge* makes repentance on his part impossible, and so prevents his salvation. If the literal statement that "the power and inclination to repent are not found except when God is revealed in Christ," and other statements of similar import, are to be insisted upon, then none of the race who lived before Christ had power to repent, for to none of them was God revealed in Christ. Moreover by far the larger part of the race who have lived since Christ, including we know not how large a number who, though living in Christendom, have had no adequate knowledge of God in Christ, have been equally powerless to repent. According to the teachings of *Progressive Orthodoxy*, the salvation of all those uncounted millions has been prevented, not simply by their aversion to holiness, but because they had *no power to repent*. And having no power to repent, they were not to be *blamed* for

not repenting. Their impenitence was no sin. Who *was* to blame for their impenitence, and for their dying in sin? Here is created a *needless* imputation against God, — and what for? — *in order* to compel the inference that God must give them the power and opportunity to repent in Hades.

But the Andover Creed says of every sinner, who has lived on the face of the earth and gone down to death impenitent for his sins, that *nothing but his own aversion to holiness has prevented his salvation*. He *alone* was responsible for his impenitence, and God was just. Thus, the Andover Creed gives a true and *Scriptural* Theodicy, while *Progressive Orthodoxy* breaks down utterly in its attempted *speculative* Theodicy. And the New Theology is found again to be in direct and irreconcilable conflict with that which the Seminary was founded to maintain. The two can never be believed and taught by the same man.

6. The Andover Creed teaches that man of himself, man as constituted by his Creator, has complete power to repent of his sins, and that his repentance will be an accepted and effectual condition of his salvation from sin and death through the redeeming grace of God in Christ.

But *Progressive Orthodoxy* teaches, that man cannot truly repent, save as he not only knows Christ, but also is "*in Christ*." No repentance of his can be radical and revolutionary, or of any avail in the line of his salvation, unless he is "*in Christ*," "*in union with Christ*." The teaching on this point is as follows [p. 55]: —

In union with Christ, who brings spiritual truth and power to man, repentance is radical. Man left to himself cannot have a repentance which sets him free from sin and death. But *in Christ* he is moved to repentance which is revolutionary; *in Christ* he can express repentance, for *in union* with Christ he adopts the feeling of Christ concerning sin against the God of love. If man unaided could become truly repentant, he would become holy, and would be the child of God. . . . But it is only *in Christ* that he has such knowledge of God and of himself as is necessary to a repentance which is revolutionary. [Italics ours.]

But what is meant by the phrases, "*in Christ*," "*in union with Christ*"? Are these expressions used in their Scriptural and usual sense? Does the phrase, "*in Christ*" mean what Paul meant by it, when he said, "If any man be *in Christ* he is a new creature," "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are *in Christ Jesus*"? If so, then *Progressive Orthodoxy*

is teaching that man must be "a new creature" before he can repent; must be forgiven, regenerated, justified and saved from his sins, before he can repent of them; must be a *Christian*, before he can repent, or can even be *moved* to repentance. Doubtless this is not exactly what the writer means. Yet it is what he *says*, and it is difficult to see, how it can be right to use familiar and sacred phraseology out of its ordinary sense without frank and full explanation. The passage just quoted is vague and mystical. But what is *under* the mysticism? The true interpretation is suggested, but not declared, in the following brief statements found in the same article from which we have been making quotations, and, for the most part, in close connection with those quotations.

So we have become accustomed to the thought that Christ has an *organic relation* to the race. He is an individual, but an individual *vitaly related* to every human being. He preferred to be called the Son of Man. Paul sees in Him the Head of humanity, the Second Adam. [*Prog. Orth.* p. 52.]

He [Christ] is one, *in with the race*, who *has the power* of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling towards God and towards sin; and so God looks on the race as having this power *in Christ* [55-56].

This Christ *in with the race* is regarded by God as one who has those powers of instruction, sympathy, purity which *can be imparted* to his brethren. Likewise the individual *in Christ* takes the place of the individual without Christ, is looked on as one whom *Christ can bring to repentance and obedience*, and so is justified *even before* faith develops into character [p. 56].

The *race* is *reconstituted in Christ*, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing *powers for repentance and holiness* which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of [p. 56].

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for *that is beyond man's power*. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, *makes the race* to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting [p. 58].

The theory, sufficiently set forth in these extracts, is that of the universal Headship of Christ in the human race. According to this theory, Christ is the Head not simply of the church, which *is* his body, but of the *entire human race*. He is the second Adam. Not simply believers, but all human beings, are organically and vitally related to him. No man is separate from him. Mankind, from Adam to the last child born on earth, is *in union with Christ*.

The Son of God comes into humanity, and the *race*, by a mystical union, is made *one* with him. The union is as real as that of the human body with its head. Every member of the race is as

truly united to Christ, as every member of the human body is united to the head of the body. Such is the doctrine. It is not simply a theory, but is set forth as a cardinal belief. It will probably be found to be the germ and root of this whole system of New Theology. It constructs and vitalizes all the other doctrines of Progressive Orthodoxy. Notice its relation to the new doctrine of repentance. Man of himself cannot repent. He is as impotent to do this as is a piece of wood. But Christ appears, becomes the Head of the race; and the race is reconstructed in Him. Every man is brought into organic and vital union with Him, and *in this union* receives power to repent. Christ imparts this power, He "*makes the race to its worst individual capable of repenting.*" The race now contains "*powers for repentance and holiness, which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of.*" It is represented, that Christ "*realizing*" this power "*in some,*" is "*able to realize it in all.*" "*The entire race repents or is capable of repenting through Christ.*" [*Prog. Orth.* p. 54.] And this imparted power of repentance, it is claimed, is *mighty* beyond all estimate. It is declared to be "*the power of recuperation,*" and to be "*superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and of present habit.*" [*Prog. Orth.* p. 55.] The repentance thus secured, it is affirmed, is radical and revolutionary, the only true repentance.

Before calling your attention to the relation of this theory, of the universal Headship of Christ in the human race, to the Andover Creed, it is needful to view distinctly the question; Has man, even when organically and vitally related to Christ, power to repent, unless he has knowledge of Christ, and of God in Christ? How does the New Theology answer this question?

We call your attention to two sample statements in *Progressive Orthodoxy*. On page 47, it is declared, "*that the power and inclination to repent are not found except when God is revealed in Christ.*" On page 56, it is declared, that "*The race is reconstituted in Christ; and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing powers for repentance and holiness which without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of.*" In the first passage, it is distinctly affirmed, that the power to repent is *not found* except when God is known in Christ. In the second passage, with equal distinctness, it is affirmed, that the *race has* power to repent by virtue of having been reconstituted in Christ.

All men have power for repentance, of which they would be hopelessly destitute but for their vital relation to their incarnate Lord. These two statements, on the face of them, are in direct conflict, the one affirming that the power to repent is *never found* in a man who does not know Christ; the other affirming, that every man, whether he knows Christ or not, *has power* to repent by virtue of belonging to the race as reconstituted in Christ. How are these conflicting statements to be reconciled? A possible — perhaps the probable — explanation is this: The idea in the first passage may be, that the power to repent is “*not found*” in the soul, that it is not *apparent*, is not brought into *exercise*, or *realized*, except when Christ is known. The power is there, but is *latent*, *inoperative*, and cannot be brought into exercise until Christ is revealed. The meaning of the second passage evidently is, that the *race* — and so every man in it — receives this dormant and unrealized power to repent through union with the incarnate Christ. Indeed, that the two statements are thus to be harmonized is made quite evident by a passage on page 54, where it is represented that man “under the appropriate influences” is “*capable of repenting*.” He cannot repent, save as he is *influenced* from without, and in a particular way. He has a latent, slumbering power to repent, yet it is utterly worthless to him until Christ is known. Thus he *has power*, and at the same time has *not power*, to repent. It is a power that can never be realized or made actual by any sinner, until he has knowledge of the Lord in his earthly life, the historic Christ. It is doubtless to this latent and inoperative power in men, that reference is made, on p. 54, in the declaration, that “The power of repentance remains, and to *this* power the gospel addresses itself. Christ suffering and sympathizing with men is able to awaken in them and express for them a real repentance. It is to this power that Christ, the holy and the merciful, attaches himself. Realizing it in some, and being able to realize it in all, He represents humanity before God.”

The teaching of the New Theology, therefore, on the subject now before us, appears to be; First, that man as now constituted, has no power of any kind to repent; Secondly, that as *reconstituted*, in common with the race, through the Incarnation of Christ, he receives power to repent, which abides in him, which yet is utterly useless — a powerless power — until Christ is known to him. Thirdly, that *only* when Christ is known to man, can the latter have any actual or realized power to repent. This *knowl-*

edge is the one supreme necessity. Neither Christ himself, nor the Holy Spirit, nor any other power, human or divine, can bring a single sinner to repentance except through the sinner's own knowledge of Christ. Through this knowledge, and only through this knowledge, Christ, and only Christ, realizes in sinful men the power to repent. *He*, we are told, *does* realize it in some, and is *able* to realize it in all.

What now is the relation of this theory of repentance through organic union with Christ, to the doctrine required to be taught at Andover?

1. This New Departure theory of Christ's universal Headship flatly denies the statement of the Andover Creed. That Creed affirms that man, as already constituted, has real and complete power to repent. The New Theology affirms, that man of himself cannot repent, that, only as he is *reconstituted* in Christ, has he any powers for repentance and holiness.

2. The plain, common-sense and Scriptural doctrine of the Creed, that man has natural ability to do all that God requires of him, is supplanted by the vague, dreamy and utterly unscriptural theory, that Christ through his Incarnation, is organically and vitally united to every man, and in that mystical union imparts to every man a dormant and useless power to repent.

3. The doctrine of the Creed is, that man has, in his own constitution and in the working of his constitutional powers, both the ability and the motive to repent. The teaching of the New Theology is, that the sinner, though organically and vitally united to the incarnate Christ, has no *available* power, and, of course, can be subject to no motive, to repent, until Christ is known to him.

4. The violent antagonism of this new theory of repentance to the theology required at Andover is indicated by the kind of preaching which it legitimately inspires. A clergyman's theology, if he is true to himself, will determine the substance and type of his preaching. How is the alleged truth of Christ's vital and universal union with men, and the consequent impartation to them of powers for repentance and holiness, to be preached? The preacher must say to men, to even the worst man; "You are reconstituted in Christ. Christ is in organic and vital union with you, and you with Him. In this union you have powers for repentance and holiness, of which you would otherwise be hopelessly destitute. You are '*in Christ*' and Christ is *in you*. From your birth Christ has been organically and vitally related to you, and you to Him. But

you have had no knowledge of this. You have not known the *Christ in you*, and consequently have not known Christ as He is. Yet this very knowledge is essential to any realized ability on your part to obey God in Christ. Thus you have had no *available* power to repent. Therefore no blame rests upon you for your impenitence. Your impenitence has not been a sin. But now that you know Christ as he is, true repentance is possible to you. In union with Christ, you can have a repentance that is radical and revolutionary. Look, then, to the *Christ in you*, who can *move* you, *realize* in you, and *express* for you, a repentance which shall set you free from sin and death."

"You are also required to 'come to Christ.' But how can you come to *Christ*? Come to yourself, to your better self, for your better self is *Christ in you*. You ought to be a Christian. Do you ask how you can become a Christian? *Be yourself*, your *true* self, and more and more be your *true* self; for your *true* self is the *Christ* in you. Jesus said, 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' But how can you come into the experience of that new birth? *Build upon the best that is in you*, for the *best* that is in you is *Christ*. Know that when you were born in to this world you were born into Christ, and ever since your natural birth you have been in organic union with him, a member of his body — for Christ is the Head of every man."

In describing this preaching, we are not drawing from our fancy or imagination. Young men under the teachings of the New Theology are in training to preach what they have been taught. They will preach it. Already there are indications that this is to be the new style of preaching. It is *another* gospel that is thus set forth, yet *not* another. Is there any need of saying, that such preaching can never be inspired by a belief in the Andover Creed, or in any other evangelical Creed in Christendom?

5. The notion of the universal Headship of Christ in the human race, out of which comes the New Departure theory of repentance, is opposed to numerous statements, and to the whole spirit and drift, of the Andover Creed, for its logical, inevitable and speedy result is Universalism. If the *race* is reconstituted in *Christ*, if through the Incarnation *every man* is brought into *vital* union with the incarnate and now glorified Lord, how can any man be lost? If a man is *in Christ* and *Christ in him*, can that man perish? And if all men are thus organically related to Christ, can *any* man perish? If Christ, in the meaning of this theory, is the *Head* of the *race*,

the *race* is his *body*, and can any member of the *body of Christ* perish! The teachers of the New Theology believe, that, Christ being in this vital union with every man, it is reasonable to infer that every man will sometime, — if not in this world, then in Hades, have knowledge of Christ, with abundant opportunity to repent. But it is equally reasonable to infer from the same premise, that every man will be *saved*. Organic and vital union with Christ is salvation. And as no man is “separate” from Christ [*Prog. Orth.* p. 66] all men are saved.

We are aware that Professor Smyth denies now that he believes in universal salvation. But how long will he deny it? It is no uncommon thing for men to adopt new beliefs, and yet deny, at first, the implications that legitimately and practically go with them. But when theological teachers do this, usually their students outrun them, and adopt *with* the new beliefs all the natural implications and inferences. A Statute of the Seminary requires the Professor to *oppose* Universalism, and he has promised to do so. But to hold and teach beliefs which *lead* to Universalism is not to oppose, but to encourage, that error, and is a violation of the Statute.

IV. *Our sixth complaint is, that Professor Smyth holds, maintains and inculcates: That the atonement of Christ consists essentially and chiefly in his becoming identified with the human race through his Incarnation, in order that, by his union with men he might endow them with the power to repent, and thus impart to them an augmented value in the view of God, and so render God propitious towards them.*

Every Professor in subscribing to the Andover Creed makes this declaration :

I believe . . . that Christ, as our Redeemer, executeth the office of a Prophet, Priest, and King; that agreeably to the covenant of redemption, the Son of God, and he alone, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men; that repentance, faith, and holiness are the personal requisites in the Gospel scheme of salvation; that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner's justification; that this righteousness is received through faith; and that this faith is the gift of God; so that our salvation is wholly of grace.

The portion of the Creed now cited obviously includes the following statements of doctrine ; — not of opinion, but of *doctrine*.

1. That Christ, as our Redeemer, took upon himself the office of priest, and in that priestly office offered himself as a sacrifice for sin.

2. That it was in accordance with a divine arrangement, or determination, called the Covenant of Redemption, that the Son of God made atonement for the sins of men.

3. That the Son of God made this atonement *by his sufferings and death*. The statement is *not* that He made atonement by his incarnation, or by his whole life of humiliation; nor by the sacrifice He made in coming, through his humanity, into close and disagreeable contact with sinful men; but that He made atonement specifically *by his sufferings and death*. The Creed emphasizes the fact that the atoning work of Christ was achieved in the final and priestly offering of himself as a sacrifice for sin. It describes the atonement as wrought essentially and chiefly in his death. It glorifies the cross.

4. That Christ *alone* made the atonement. The fact that Christ was the *sole* author of this saving work is stated with special distinctness. The language is; "The Son of God, and *He alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement" for sins. No other being or beings were united to him, or identified with him in that stupendous sacrifice. No man or angel took part in it. Separate and alone his soul was made an offering for sin.

5. That the Son of God made atonement for the sins of *all men*. But while the atonement is thus declared to be universal, it is stated elsewhere in this same Creed, that God "from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, and that He entered into a covenant of grace, to deliver *them* out of this state of sin and misery by a Redeemer." The complete statement of the Creed, then, is, that while Christ made atonement for the sins of the entire race, He actually redeems and saves only those who are chosen of God.

6. That the atonement, made by the Son of God, and by him *alone*, in his sufferings and death, was a *vicarious* atonement. It was made "*for the sins*" of men, and therefore *for* sinful men themselves.

The doctrine of the Creed is, that Christ took our place, and, as the Son of God, and our High Priest, endured immeasurable grief and pain in our stead. He offered *himself* a *substitute* for guilty and condemned men, and offered his *sufferings* as an *equivalent* for the penal sufferings threatened of God's holy law against sinners. It was not *with* sinners, but *for* them, that he

suffered in his death. It was not in *organic union with them*, but *in their stead*, that He was sacrificed on the cross. The race was not *with him* in making the atonement, He *alone* made it. The race, having Christ in it, was not a substitute *for itself*. Christ *alone* was a substitute *for the race*. *Apart* and *alone* he stood in his priestly atoning sacrifice. No human being, no angel, was identified with him, as in vital union with him, as *in him*, in his passion and death. Such is the doctrine of the Creed. Nothing can be more explicit than its two statements, that “The Son of God, *and He alone*,” made atonement, and that He made atonement “*for all men*,” — not *with* all men, — and *in* them, but *apart* from them, and *for* them. And his sufferings and death avail with God, not because they give sinners new capacities, and make them of more consequence in the sight of God, but because they were endured *for* sinners, and can be righteously accepted of God as a substitute for the punishment which they deserve.

7. The declaration of the Creed includes the statement, that “the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner’s justification.” The “righteousness of Christ” was “his obedience unto death.” [Prof. Park on The Associate Creed, p. 35.] The doctrine stated here is, that God cannot maintain his justice and holiness in justifying and saving sinners, except *on the ground of*, or because of, Christ’s obedience unto death. That obedience, or righteousness, was his atoning sacrifice, in which He offered *himself* a substitute for sinners, and his *sufferings and death* as an equivalent for the punitive sufferings which sinners deserve. Christ’s obedience unto death availed with God, not because it made men more powerful and of more worth in his sight, but because it made it *possible* for God consistently and righteously to justify sinners, — *possible* for him to remit their sins and raise them to glory without any stain upon his own holiness, or any breaking down of his own justice, or of the authority of his holy law.

8. The declaration of the Creed includes the statement, that “penitence, faith and holiness are the personal requisites in the Gospel scheme of salvation.” That is, these are the *conditions* to be fulfilled by sinners, in order that they may be redeemed from sin and death, through the atoning sacrifice, of Christ. As sinful men, on account of their aversion to holiness, *will* not penitently believe either in this atoning sacrifice, or in him who offered it, God graciously gives the convicting and regenerating influences of

his Holy Spirit, and the pleading words and love of Christ to *make* them *willing to believe*. Thus faith is the gift of God, and our salvation is not, in any degree, *due* to ourselves, but *is wholly* of grace.

These several statements and interpretations, we think, present the obvious and true meaning of that portion of the Creed now before us. But we do not ask you to take our word for the correctness of our interpretation. No man living has had better opportunities to learn the meaning which the Founders themselves attached to their own Symbol of Faith, or has given to that Symbol a more painstaking and exhaustive examination, than Professor E. A. Park, D.D. We ask your careful attention to his comments upon those passages which express the views of the Founders upon the great doctrine of the Atonement. We quote from Professor Park's treatise, entitled, "The Associate Creed of Andover Theological Seminary" [p. 35]. Speaking of this famous Symbol, he says :

It overflows with riches on the most precious doctrine, for the maintenance of which the Seminary was instituted. It has a deep meaning when it omits all reference to "the righteousness of Christ *imputed* to us," and when it omits all reference to some of the high Hopkinsian views in regard to the atonement. It *allows* various principles which it does not *require*. But it does *not* allow a single one of the errors of the "new departure." It forbids them all. In the *most moderate interpretation* of its words, as explained by its framers, it requires a belief in the following principles: The God-man is our priest, our royal priest, our royal prophet-priest. In this royal priestly office he offers the sacrifice for sin. This sacrifice, in its very nature, involves the idea of his death and sufferings, all of which represent the legal penalty for sin, and are, for the purposes of moral government, of equal avail with that penalty. The pains and death of the Lamb of God were designed to vindicate the *honor* of God's law, and of his retributive justice, as much as it would have been vindicated by inflicting the legal penalty on the penitent; this is the *nature* of his sacrifice. Our High Priest's righteousness, that is, his obedience unto death, is the only *ground* on which sinners can be justified; and their faith, which receives and rests upon this "obedience unto death," is the only *condition* on which they can be justified; and these two facts explain the very nature of the atoning sacrifice. The faith of man in this sacrifice is a "faith to feed upon Christ," that is, to be nourished by the great truths involved in the body broken and the blood shed for transgressors;—the sacrament of the Lord's Supper reveals the spirit of the sacrificial death. Agreeably to the arrangement called the covenant of redemption, the Redeemer made the atonement for all men: agreeably to the arrangement called the covenant of grace, the Sovereign of the universe determined from all eternity, on the ground of this atonement, to regenerate and pardon some men; accordingly Christ suffered and died for the whole race, but is the actual and only Redeemer of only a part of the race.

Such is Professor Park's interpretation of the statements of the Creed upon the doctrine of the atonement. Dr. Leonard Wood's interpretation was the same. He taught as *doctrines* of the Creed, not as opinions, but as *doctrines*, that Christ *alone* made atonement for the sins of all men, that in his sufferings and death he offered himself a sacrifice for sinners, that he was their substitute, and that his sufferings and death were accepted as an equivalent for the punishment deserved by sinners. [*Works*, vol. ii. *Lectures on the Atonement*, pp. 456-464.] Professor Moses Stuart was intimately acquainted with the Founders of the Seminary, and knew how they interpreted their own Symbol of Faith: and his statement concerning Christ's atoning work is, that:

His sufferings and death were, by divine appointment, accepted instead of the punishment due to us as sinners, and that God, in consequence of the offering made by Christ, pardons our offences and restores us to his favor. And he adds, This also is just what I mean when I say, that *Christ in his sufferings and death was our SUBSTITUTE.* [*Miscellanies*, p. 223.]

But what is the theory of the atonement, now taught at Andover, as set forth in the volume entitled *Progressive Orthodoxy*, for the teachings of which Professor Egbert C. Smyth is responsible?

1. *Progressive Orthodoxy denies* that the Son of God *alone* made atonement for the sins of man, but affirms, that whatever he did in the direction of atonement he accomplished in *union with* the entire human race. Notice the following affirmations:

Thus we can regard Him [Christ] as our substitute, not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another, but because He is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with his [p. 53]. He is one, in with the race, who has the power of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling towards God and towards sin [pp. 55-6]. Humanity with Christ in it is propitiated to the divine thought from all eternity [p. 61]. In the Atonement Christ the Son of Man brings all humanity to God. No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself [p. 66].

The Creed says that "the Son of God, and *he alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men." *Progressive Orthodoxy* says: "No member of the human race is separate from him who thus offers himself." Also it says, "When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful" [p. 53]. All this looks very much as if Christ were *not alone* in making the atonement, as if the entire race

took part with him in accomplishing that stupendous work, as if every man *with* Christ made atonement for his own sins.

It is impossible to understand the New Departure views of the atonement, or, indeed, of hardly any religious doctrine, without first understanding and then keeping constantly in mind, the theory of the universal headship of Christ in the human race, or as it is sometimes called with a still larger meaning, "the universality of Christ's Person." This theory has already been alluded to, but there is need that it be as clearly and fully apprehended as such a mystical notion can be. It is not the Scriptural doctrine that Christ is the Head of the *Church*, which *is* his body; nor that He was the Federal Head of the race, that is, its representative, or substitute; nor yet that He is Head *over* all things *to* the Church, the only Creator and supreme Sovereign; but the notion is, that through his incarnation, or by virtue of being the *Son of Man*, He is the Head of the entire human race, in the sense, that every human being is *organically* and *vitaly related* to him, *identified* with him, and *reconstituted* in him. The *union* of every man with Christ is believed to be as vital and real as that of the members of the human, fleshly body with their head.

This speculation is set forth in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, in such language as the following:

He (Christ) has kinship with us all by being our common Head [p. 19]. But it lies also in His mediatorship that He is the head of the race, and not a mere member of it, and that humanity in Him becomes receptive of the divine fulness, so that there are gathered up in Him all divine gifts for men [p. 21]. One view of the atonement is gained by considering the historical Christ in relation to humanity and as *identified* with it; in which view we see, that the race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it. . . . So we have become accustomed to the thought that Christ has an *organic* relation to the race. He is an individual, but an individual *vitaly* related to every human being. He preferred to be called the Son of Man. Paul sees in Him the Head of humanity, the second Adam [p. 52]. Christ, as has been shown in preceding discussions, is the universal man. . . . His relationship is not tribal or national, but human, as *comprehensive as the race*. He is the second Adam, the head and progenitor of renewed humanity [p. 73].

On p. 110, we find this affirmation:

The movement of Christian thought with which we sympathize signifies, in its deepest meaning, the exaltation of Jesus Christ as the Head of humanity, the Son of God, the Redeemer of men, the Mediator of God to the

whole universe. For us He is all this, or else He is in no peculiar sense sent of God, and we have no gospel of redemption.

This is a significant statement. It is nothing distinctive of the New Theology to exalt Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the Redeemer and the Mediator, but it *is* distinctive of it, *not* to exalt Him as *the Head of his Church*, which *is* his body, and yet to exalt him as the Head of a *fallen, sinful* and condemned race which is *not* his body, but which He came to redeem, offering himself an atoning sacrifice for it, so that whosoever will may be united to Him and to his redeemed body in love, service and eternal glory.

The citations now made sufficiently set forth the New Departure notion of Christ's organic and vital union, through his incarnation, with every human being. Every human being, then, was *with* and *in* Christ in making the atonement. Christ separate and alone did *not* offer the atoning sacrifice. Our first statement therefore is abundantly sustained. Progressive Orthodoxy flatly *denies* this teaching of the Creed, namely that the Son of God *alone* — not *with* any other being — but *separate* and *alone*, by his sufferings and death made atonement for sin. On the other hand, Progressive Orthodoxy affirms: that "No member of the race is separate from him who thus offers himself."

2. The New Theology, in its theory of Christ's *substitutionary* relation to men, sharply antagonizes the Creed.

The doctrine of the Andover Creed, — not *our opinion*, but the Scriptural *doctrine* — involved in the statements of the *Creed* respecting the atonement as they have been understood and interpreted by all the Professors who have taught theology in the Seminary, from the beginning until recent years — is that the Son of God, in his atoning sacrifice, offered himself as a divinely appointed substitute for sinners, and that his sufferings and death were accepted of God as equivalent to, and a substitute for, the penal sufferings which sinners deserved. But the New Theology advocates another kind of sacrificial atonement and substitution — a novel *theory* which cannot possibly be reconciled with the doctrine in which the Founders believed, which they put into their Creed, and which always, until very recently, has been taught in the Seminary. The new speculation is stated in the following words:

The substitution is not of Christ standing on this side *for* the race standing on that side, but the race with Christ in it is substituted for the race without Christ in it. . . . Likewise the individual in Christ takes the place of the individual without Christ [p. 56].

According to this view, the union of the individual with Christ his Head is substituted for non-union with him. *No one* being takes the place of the sinner. *No one* being performs a vicarious and saving work for *men*. The *union* of the *race* with Christ its Head is substituted for *non-union* of the race with Christ. Christ, *separate and alone*, is substituted for nobody. Yet one statement on p. 53 begins in this way: "Thus we can regard Him as our substitute, not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another." But how *can* He be a substitute for the race, unless He *is* one, and the race another? If He and the race are identical, can there be any substitution? Can a unit be substituted for itself? It is inconsistent for the New Theology to call Christ "*our substitute*:" for He, in his sacrifice, is a substitute for no one. Our only substitute is ourselves in union with Christ. Christ alone takes the place of no sinner. He alone is not a vicarious Saviour. He has not suffered and died in our stead, and his sufferings and death have not been accepted of God as an equivalent for our deserved punishment. This, indeed, is admitted on p. 57 in these words, "It must be confessed, however, that it is not clear how the sufferings and death of Christ can be substituted for the punishment of sin."

But according to the theology of the Andover Symbol of faith, the very *heart* of the atonement is, that our Lord's priestly sacrifice of himself in his sufferings and death *was* a vicarious sacrifice, and that his sufferings and death *were* substituted for the punishment of sin. He *alone* was our High Priest. He *alone* was *our* sacrifice, offered *for* us. He suffered, then, in our stead. And *what* he endured *for* us *is* accepted of God as a substitute for the penal sufferings we deserve.

These two views of the atonement, the New Departure view and the Creed view, are out of all sympathy with one another, and there seems to be no possible way in which they can be brought into harmony.

3. The New Theology antagonizes the teaching of the Andover Creed, in representing that God is propitiated towards sinners, *on the ground* that the incarnate Christ has imparted to them powers for repentance and holiness, and so given them an importance and value, in the sight of God which they would not otherwise possess.

The doctrine of the Andover Symbol is, that God has become propitious towards sinners *on the ground* of Christ's atoning sacrifice; in other words, that He is graciously disposed towards

them, and stands ready to justify and save penitent and believing sinners, *because* Christ has taken their place, suffered and died for them. But *Progressive Orthodoxy* affirms "that the race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it" [p. 52]. The representation in this language seems to be, that God *looks more favorably* upon the race, because Christ, in his incarnation, has become vitally related to it. He is propitious towards all men, *because* all men are in organic union with Christ. Again it is stated, that "the individual in Christ takes the place of the individual without Christ, is looked on as one whom Christ can bring to repentance and obedience, and so is justified even before faith develops into character" [p. 56]. This seems to teach, that God is propitious towards the individual sinner, and also justifies him even before faith develops into character, *because* He sees that Christ is vitally united to him, and so is able to bring him to repentance and obedience. This *union of Christ* with the human race is the *one fact* that is of supreme power in propitiating God. We are told, that "He is one, in with the race, who has *the power* of bringing it into sympathy with his own feeling towards God and towards sin; and so *God* looks on the race as having this power in Christ" [pp. 55-6]. Thus every member of the race is regarded by God as of more consequence and worth on account of his union with Christ, and on *this* ground God smiles upon him and stands ready to justify him.

Another statement is, that "the race is reconstituted in Christ, and is other in the sight of God, because different in fact, because containing powers for repentance and holiness which, without Christ, it would be hopelessly destitute of" [p. 56]. We have here a positive statement, that the entire race is "*other* in the sight of God," — and it being *other*, he stands of course in *other* attitudes towards it — *because* it is reconstituted in Christ, and so *has powers* for repentance and holiness, which it otherwise could not have. The *ground*, then, of God's gracious favor to the race, is that Christ, in his vital union with it, has imparted to it certain new and invaluable powers. Is *that* the teaching of the Andover Creed? Can *that* be harmonized with the Andover Symbol of Faith?

We are also told, that:

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, makes the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting" [p. 58].

The representation in this passage appears to be, that the *ground* of God's being propitious to the entire sinful race, is, that the incarnate Christ, not simply by his union with the race, but by his death, imparts to every man, even the worst, the *capability* of repenting, obeying, trusting. God looks upon this *capability* imparted *through* Christ's death, and is propitiated.

In view of all these representations, then, the theory seems to be, that, in whatever way the power or capability of rendering obedience is imparted, *by* the *impartation* of it augmented importance and value are given to the race *in God's view*, and *so* he is propitiated towards it, and stands ready to justify and save sinners.

Now how can this theory be reconciled with the doctrine of the Andover Formulary of Belief? According to *that* Confession, the only *ground* upon which God becomes propitious to sinful men is the *atoning sacrifice of Christ*. According to the New Theology, the only *ground* upon which God becomes propitious to sinners, is, the impartation to them by Christ of *power to repent*. The Andover Confession teaches that the *only ground* of a penitent and believing sinner's justification is Christ's obedience unto death. The New Theology teaches that, the sinner *in Christ*, taking the place of the sinner *without* Christ, "*is looked on as one whom Christ can bring to repentance and obedience, and so is justified even before faith develops into character*" [p. 56]. The doctrine of the Andover Formulary of Faith is, that Christ's sacrifice avails with God because it is an *atoning* and *vicarious* sacrifice; because it is the *only ground* on which he can justify sinners. The theory of the New Theology is that "Christ's sacrifice avails with God, *because it is adapted to bring man to repentance*" [p. 55].

4. *Progressive Orthodoxy* antagonizes the Andover Creed, in teaching, that the atonement of Christ consists essentially and chiefly in his becoming identified with the human race through his incarnation, and not in his sufferings and death. The doctrine of the Seminary Symbol is, that, "The Son of God, and He alone, *by his sufferings and death*, has made atonement for the sins of all men." Then He, and He alone, made atonement *in* his sufferings and death, and the atonement consists in *his passion and sacrifice*.

Now the atonement of the incarnate Son of God is his *substitutionary*, or *vicarious* work, whatever that work was. This seems to be admitted by the Progressive Divines. But what, in the view

of the New Theology, *is* the substitutionary work of Christ? We find such statements as these :

The substitution is not of Christ standing on this side for the race standing on that side, but the race with Christ in it is substituted for the race without Christ in it. . . . Likewise the individual in Christ takes the place of the individual without Christ [p. 56].

These declarations, and others like them, as we have already shown, set forth the only vicariousness or substitution of any kind found in the New Departure theory of the atonement. Let it be observed, that it is not the race alone that is substituted, nor Christ alone, but "the race with Christ in it;" that is, it is the *union* of the *two* that is substituted for the race without that union. That *union* of Christ *with the race* is the *incarnation*, as set forth in the theory of the universal headship of Christ. Therefore *that* incarnation is the atonement. *That* incarnation, or that *union* of Christ, in his humanity, with the race, and *that alone*, in this theory, is *substitutionary*. The *death* of Christ, so far as it is a part of the incarnation, or is necessarily connected with it, may be considered as, in some sort, a part of the atonement; but it is relegated to a subordinate place; for it is the *union* of Christ *with the race*, his identification with men — not his death — that constitutes the vicarious element, according to this theory. The atonement, therefore, consists essentially and chiefly in that *substitutionary union* of Christ with the race; and his sufferings and death can be only incidental, even if necessarily incidental, to that union. The relation of his sufferings and death to the incarnation, or to the vicarious atonement of the New Theology, is very much like that of his birth to the same. His birth was essential to his incarnation. So his death was essential to his temporary incarnation. He could not have been glorified without some kind of *termination* to his life in the flesh. It might be said, that Christ became incarnate, or was born, *on account* of our sins, with *reference* to them, born that He might become vitally united with sinners and give them power to repent of their sins. So it may be said, that Christ *died on account* of our sins, or even *for* our sins, died in order to complete the incarnation by which sinners are empowered to repent of their sins. These things can be said of both the birth and death of Christ, without meaning that either of them constitutes essentially and chiefly the atonement.

Moreover, in the New Theology, special emphasis is placed

upon the fact, that Christ's death was a tragic and pathetic event, fitted to reveal vividly the wickedness of the men who crucified him, and so indirectly the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and at the same time to manifest his own righteousness and compassion, to present to the world a realization of God's love, and in all this to move persuasively the sensibilities and wills of men. But this does not indicate that Christ's death had any thing more than a secondary importance in the atonement. If the atonement consisted essentially and chiefly in Christ's *substitutionary* relations and work, then it consisted, according to the New Departure theory, in his organic and vital union with the race; for the only substitution recognized in this theory of the atonement is that of the race *with* Christ in it, *for* the race *without* Christ in it.

Again, the atonement of the incarnate Son of God is his *propitiatory* work, whatever that work may be. But what his propitiatory work, according to the New Theology, is, we have already seen. We are told, that:

God does not become propitious because man repents and amends, for that is beyond man's power. He becomes propitious because Christ, laying down his life, *makes* the race to its worst individual *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting [p. 58].

That is, because Christ, through his death, gives the race a new *capability*, God is propitiated to the race. God is *not* made propitious by Christ's atoning sacrifice, but only by *man's* being made, *through Christ's death*, *capable* of repenting, obeying, trusting. But *how* is this capability imparted to man through Christ's death? According to *Progressive Orthodoxy*, Christ's death was not a propitiatory sacrifice, as it was not a substitute for the punishment of the sinner. *But*, in its *manner*, it was "an astonishing, revealing, persuasive, melting fact," fitted to accomplish certain ethical ends, to move man's emotional and elective powers, and so make him *capable* of obeying God. By Christ's birth into the race and his vital union with it, he imparts to every man the *power* to repent, and to obey God in all things. But the impartation of that power is not enough. Before man is *capable* of repenting, he must have *knowledge of Christ* and of God in him; must know Christ in his historic life, as the head of the race, as united to every man, as bringing, in his gospel, heavenly truth and love to men, and among all these and other methods of *knowing* the historic Jesus, it is needful to know him *in his death*. The per-

suasive and energizing power of this *knowledge*, however obtained, of the personal Christ is regarded, by the New Theology, as indispensable in the work of making men *capable* of obeying God.

But this indispensable knowledge, as just intimated, may be gained in different ways, some learning of him through one aspect of his Person and work, and others through other aspects. Had Christ ended his life by a peaceful and glorious translation like that of Elijah, the *essential and chief elements* of this new kind of atonement would have remained all the same. The incarnation with all its vicariousness and propitiation would not have been changed. The race with Christ in it would still have been substituted for the race without Christ in it. God would still have been propitiated by Christ's *impartation* to men of power to repent. Men would still have had knowledge of the Historic Christ — which knowledge is regarded by the Progressive Divines as of supreme importance, — would still have had also knowledge of *God* in Christ, and of nearly all the revelations of truth and love which Christ made to man *before his death*. This shows how *very far*, according to the New Theology, the sufferings and death of Christ are from being central and supreme in the atonement. Whatever ethical influence may be ascribed to *such* a death of *such* a man — to a death so cruel and wicked, so melting and persuasive, yet that death of Christ with his passion does not in the New Theology, as in that of the Creed, constitute the vicarious and propitiatory atonement of the Son of God. Christ's sufferings and death, as regarded by Progressive Orthodoxy, have simply a revealing and persuasive function. They manifest the love of God and the sinfulness of sin, stir the sensibilities, and determine the choices of men, in precisely the same way that the tragic sufferings and death of John the Baptist did *in their measure*, and in such a way as the cruel martyrdoms of holy men have always done *in their measure*.

Still this strange theory of atonement does allow its advocates to speak of it as having an influence *Godward*, as well as manward. It *is* vicarious, and it *is* propitiatory, after a sort. Christ alone is substituted for no sinner, but the *race in union* with Christ is substituted for the race out of that union. Christ *alone* does not propitiate God towards any sinner; but Christ in union with the race, and by impartation to men, through that union, of power and capacity to repent, does propitiate God towards the race. So it is claimed. This view allows its advocates to use, to a certain

limited extent, the same phraseology which is used in speaking of the vicarious and propitiatory atonement made by the sufferings and death of Christ, — the great *doctrine* of the atonement set forth in, and required to be taught by, the Andover Creed. But, in the New Theology, the familiar phraseology is used with another meaning, and many are deceived. Allusion has already been made to a similar abuse of familiar and sacred language, in using, out of their established meaning, the phrases, “*in Christ*,” “*in union with Christ*.” Another example is found in diverting from their more usual significance, the phrases, “*knowing Christ*,” “the knowledge of Christ.” And now we find a corresponding abnormal use of language in the discussion upon the atonement. Such terms as “*vicarious*,” “*propitiatory*,” “*vicarious atonement*,” “*propitiatory atonement*,” signify something very different from that vicarious and propitiatory atonement which the Son of God, “*and He alone*” made “by His sufferings and death,” and which is “*the only ground*” of a sinner’s justification and salvation. The kind of atonement advocated in the new theory would be more exactly designated by some such terms as these: “the atoning *union* of Christ with the race,” “the substitutionary *union* of the race with Christ,” “the propitiatory *impartation* of powers and capacities to men,” or “the atoning, vicarious, and propitiatory incarnation.”

Certain complete statements, also, in the article on the atonement, as elsewhere, need to be examined and interpreted in the light of the new theory. On p. 59 is found this language: “It is true, then, that Christ suffered for our sins, and that because He suffered our sins are forgiven.” On p. 62 is this sentence, “The complete truth is that the sacrifice of Christ is an indispensable condition of the forgiveness of sin.” It would be a delightful surprise to learn, that this language means what, to most readers, it seems to say. But the sentences look singular on these pages. They are in strange company. What is their significance? Are they simply two lonely fragments of a Scriptural, but now departed, faith, found on these dreary wastes of speculative theology? Or, are the old, familiar and sacred statements used with a new meaning? We fear the latter is the true explanation. When the Progressive Divines say that “Christ suffered for our sins,” they cannot intend to affirm that Christ *died* for our sin, *vicariously* offering *himself alone* as our substitute before God, and his *sufferings* as a substitute for our punishment; *for* on

p. 57 they expressly object to that kind of substitution, saying, "It must be confessed, however, that it is not clear how the sufferings and death of Christ can be substituted for the punishment of sin." In saying that "Christ suffered *for* our sins," they *may* mean, that He suffered on account of our sins, in pity and grief for us, as a mother suffers for the wrong-doing of her son, and that *because* He thus suffered in pity and grief, we are forgiven. Or they *may* mean by Christ's suffering *for* sins, that He suffered *by reason of* them, by coming *into contact* with sinners in his incarnate life; or in his organic and vital union with them "suffered and died," as we are told on p. 59, "*in bringing the knowledge and love of God to men.*" This is doubtless what is meant. And then it would follow, that if Christ cannot come *into contact* with sinners without suffering from them, and cannot obtain forgiveness for them *without coming into contact* with them, his suffering *is*, incidentally, a "*condition*" of their forgiveness; but it is not the *ground* of their forgiveness, nor is it the *cause* of their forgiveness, nor in any way *efficient* in procuring it. In that case the sufferings and death of Christ were simply incidental, something not *desired*, but that *must be endured* to gain a certain end; like the pain and, perhaps, loss of life, incurred, when a good man plunges into a den filled with malignant and fiendish men to save some of them, if possible, from their degradation and ruin.

When it is said on p. 59 that "Christ suffered for our sins, and that because He suffered our sins are forgiven," it is immediately added, "*But* the suffering was borne because it *lay in the path* to redemption." But if the sufferings and death of Christ were borne simply because they lay in his *path*, as He hastened to redeem men, — if they were borne simply because in rescuing men He could not but come into contact with them, and suffer "*by reason of*" their sins, *then how* were his sufferings any thing more than incidental to his redeeming work? And can such a view of the atoning passion and sacrifice of our Lord be taught in Andover Seminary, in consistency with her symbol of faith? This point is vital. Pardon an illustration. A man is sick unto death. A physician hastens to his chamber, and by skilful prescriptions and surgery saves the life of the dying man. But in doing this the physician himself takes blood-poison into his system, suffers and dies. Now it would be truthful to say, in this case, that the sufferings and death of the physician were *occasioned* by his coming into contact with the sick man; that he suffered and died "*by reason of*" the man's

malignant disease; and that his sufferings and death “*lay in the path*” to the saving of that dying man. But they were only *incidental* to his salvation or recovery. It would not be truthful to say that the sufferings and death of the physician were *indispensable* to the saving of that sick man’s life; nor to say that the sick man’s life was saved *by, or through*, the sufferings and death of the physician; nor to represent that his sufferings were the *efficient* cause, or the *instrumental* cause, or were in any way *efficacious*, in saving the dying man’s life. Such representations would be false and indefensible. Equally false and indefensible, if this new theory of the atonement be true, are the statements that “the sacrifice of Christ is the indispensable condition of the forgiveness of sin,” and that “men, who are saved from sin and death, are saved through the sacrifice of Christ.” The Progressive Divines, if they can be judged by their beliefs as expressed in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, do not believe, that “the Son of God, and He *alone*, by his sufferings and death, has made atonement for the sins” of men; nor that He, and He alone, *in* his sufferings and death, was a substitute for sinners; nor that his sufferings and death were offered and accepted as a *substitute* for the punishment of sin; nor that they were a *propitiation* for the sins of the world; nor that they were the *only* ground of a sinner’s justification and redemption. But the Progressive Divines *do* believe, that Christ’s atonement—so far as He made any—was made by his *union*, through his incarnation and headship, with every human being; that the only substitution in this atonement was that of the race with Christ in it for the race without Christ in it; that the only propitiation in this atonement, and the only *ground* of a sinner’s justification and redemption, is the *impartation* to him, by Christ, of power and capacity to repent. The saddest thing about this Progressive theory of atonement is that it puts dishonor upon the sacrificial death of the Son of God, dims the glory of his cross, has no place for and seldom speaks of the Lamb slain, or of the blood of Christ, who is our passover, sacrificed for us. Such a theory is not simply antagonistic to the great Scriptural doctrine of atonement as presented in the Andover Creed, but if true, is destructive of it, and also of the whole system of Evangelical faith which the Seminary was founded to maintain and inculcate.

It appears, then, that *Progressive Orthodoxy* sharply antagonizes the Creed of the Seminary, in denying that the Son of God *alone* made atonement for the sins of men; in teaching that the only

vicariousness or substitution in the atonement, is that of the *race with Christ in it, for the race without Christ in it*; in holding to the theory, that God is propitiated not chiefly, if at all, *on the ground* of Christ's obedience unto death, but *on the ground* that the incarnate Christ, by his vital union with men, has *imparted* to them powers for repentance and holiness, and *so* given them an importance and value in the sight of God which they would not otherwise have had. Also *Progressive Orthodoxy* antagonizes the Creed irreconcilably in maintaining that the atonement consists essentially and chiefly, not in the sufferings and death of Christ, but in his organic and vital *union* with men through his humanity, making it more proper to speak of Christ's atoning, vicarious and propitiatory *union* with men, than of his atoning, vicarious and propitiatory sufferings and death.

5. To complete this argument in support of our sixth complaint, there should now be added a *fifth* statement, to the effect, that *Progressive Orthodoxy* antagonizes the Seminary Creed in certain *inferences* which it draws from the universality of the atonement.¹ To sustain this declaration properly, it would be necessary to discuss the whole question of the legality of teaching on Andover Foundations the dogma of a probation after death. This large topic has been assigned to one of my associates. It is not proper for me to go far upon his ground.

I may say, however, that the question raised in connection with subjects now discussed by me, is, do the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary allow a Professor to hold and teach the dogma, as an inference from the universality of the atonement, and of the headship of Christ in the human race, that all men sooner or later, if not in this world then in Hades, will have the historic Christ preached and offered to them as a Saviour? This question we answer emphatically in the negative, and for several reasons.

1. That there is to be a gracious probation under the gospel of Christ in Hades, for those who have not known him in this world, is not a legitimate inference from the universality of the atonement. The conclusion does not follow from the premise. The statement is made [*Prog. Orth.* p. 64] that "Atonement, that is,

¹ In reading this paper before the Board of Visitors, I interjected at this point, in an extempore way, a line of argument against the legitimacy of drawing from the universality of the atonement, and of the alleged headship of Christ in the human race, the inference of a probation after death, and of teaching that inference in the Andover Seminary. I now present in printed form, and with more clearness and fulness, the argument which was then outlined.—J. W. W.

the gospel, is universal, absolute." These terms are not defined. If they mean, that in the atonement abundant provision is made for the salvation of all men, then it is true that the atonement is universal, absolute. But by no means does it necessarily follow from *such* absoluteness of the atonement, that all men will sometime, if not in this life then in the next, have knowledge of the historic Christ; for whether they will, or will not, have such knowledge, is conditioned upon things not involved in the absoluteness of the atonement. Nor are we to conclude that all men, who in this life have no knowledge of Christ, are *lost*; for such a conclusion is contradicted by innumerable instances in which members of the race, as we have abundant reason to believe, have been saved without any such knowledge. Such deductions from the absoluteness of the atonement, or from the universality of Christ's headship in the race, are unwarranted and false. And the laws of the Seminary do not allow false reasoning and teaching on the part of the Professors.

2. Moreover we affirm, that so long as the doctrines of Election and Effectual Calling remain in the Creed, the notion of a probation in Hades cannot rightfully be held or taught, either as an inference or under any other name, by any Professor in Andover Seminary. The Founders took the statement of these doctrines from the Westminster Divines, and understood them as those Divines understood them. The doctrine of Election is, that all the members of the human race who are to be saved, were elected of God to salvation from all eternity. But how is this election to be made effectual? By the effectual calling of the elect. And none but the elect are to be effectually called. The Westminster Divines say expressly, "All the elect, and they only, are effectually called." What follows the effectual calling of all who are elected to be saved? "They who are effectually called, do, *in this life*, partake of justification, adoption, and sanctification, and the several benefits which do either accompany or flow from them." Thus says the Andover Creed. Then all of the human race, who are ever to be saved, are effectually called, justified and adopted *in this life*. Other benefits follow, some of which reach on through eternity. But that does not change the fact that, according to the Creed, all members of the race, who are ever to be saved, are called, justified and adopted *in this life*. How many then will remain to be called and justified in Hades? Not one. And if no one can be effectually called and justified in Hades, no one can have opportu-

nity to be saved there. Prof. Smyth in his elaborate and lengthy discussion upon these Creed-statements, fearing after all that they do really cut off all expectation and forbid all belief, that any sinner will be effectually called in the next world, in his desperation, ventured the remarkable affirmation, that still God may secure to some of the impenitent in the future state the preaching of the gospel, even though he knows that not one of them can be saved. This suggestion is shocking. Is God a deceiver? Will he mock men in Hades? Never. The Professor cannot in this way save even the shadow of a shadow of his darling theory that the great missionary fields are not in this world, but in that world in which Dives suffered, nor the shadow of a shadow of his pretended right to teach such a theory on Andover Foundations.

The location in the Creed of its statement of the doctrine of Effectual Calling is significant. It immediately precedes its eschatological statements. We quote from the Creed: "I believe . . . that they who are effectually called, do in this life partake of justification, adoption and sanctification, and the several benefits, which do either accompany or flow from them; that the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; . . . but that the wicked will awake to shame and everlasting contempt, and with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone for ever and ever."

The collocation of these doctrinal statements shows, that in the belief of the Founders "the souls of believers" are "the effectually called," "God's elect," "the righteous," that is, all who are ever to be saved. All these "are at their death made perfect," and "immediately pass into glory." And after all these are *at their death* made perfect and then glorified, how many will remain to be effectually called and made perfect in Hades? None. Only the wicked, as non-elect, will be left, not one of whom, according to the Creed, can ever be effectually called and saved beyond this life. Thus intensely repugnant to this Symbol of Faith is even the insinuation of *post-mortem* opportunities for repentance and salvation.

3. Again, we affirm, that no Professor in Andover Seminary can hold and teach the dogma of a probation after death, as an inference, or under any other name, and be true to his promise, made in taking the Creed, that he will oppose Universalism.

The Founders in pledging every Professor to oppose Universalism had prominently in view a particular type of that error.

When the Seminary was founded, the Father of American Universalism, the Rev. John Murray, was living in Boston. He died in 1815. For fourteen years he had been the minister of a Universalist society in Gloucester. He was installed pastor of a society in Boston in 1793, and there preached as long as he was able to labor, about sixteen years. He was preaching there the very year, 1807, in which this Seminary was founded. He was a famous man in his day. He preached in all parts of the country, and through his preaching and published writings, his views were widely disseminated. He was a man who attracted the attention of all ministers and theologians. The Founders of this Seminary must have known him, as the public knew him. They knew of his character, his writings, his beliefs, and his abounding labors in introducing and establishing Universalism. *His* was the type of Universalism which prevailed in this country when this Seminary was founded.

Now what were his beliefs, and his methods of supporting them? The radical and formative principles of his theology were identical with those of *Progressive Orthodoxy*. [*Letters and Sketches of Sermons. Three vols. By John Murray. Also Life of Rev. John Murray. With Notes and Appendix. By Rev. L. S. Everett.*] He continually preached these three doctrines, the universality of Christ's headship in the human race; a universal atonement made by Christ in organic and vital union with every man; and a final, universal, Christian judgment; that is, a judgment administered by Christ under the gospel and in personal, living union with all men. From those universalities he drew inferences after the manner of *Progressive Orthodoxy*. His methods of reasoning, and his arguments were the same as those of the modern Progressive Divines at Andover. He reasoned continually from the absoluteness and universality of the attributes of God. He did not use the word absoluteness, but did use its equivalents. He made large use of the terms universal and universality. He also magnified with rare eloquence of language the incarnation of the Son of God. It was impossible for him to write many pages without saying something, and with the greatest emphasis, about "the Son of Man," "the Head of the race," "the second Adam." On the essential doctrines of the inspiration of the Scriptures, of the deity of Christ incarnate, and of his sacrificial atonement, he was far more orthodox than are most of the present Professors at Andover. But the doctrine of the universality of Christ's atonement was his

chief joy. He could never tire of preaching it, or talking of it. He was always reasoning from such divinely recorded facts as these: "He tasted death for *every* man." "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself." "He is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*." Christ is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the *world*." He "died for all," and "is the Saviour of the *world*." From this universality of the atonement he was ever arguing that all men will sometime and somewhere know Christ; if not in this life, then in the next. He preached that no man can be consciously or experimentally saved *without knowledge of Christ*. Sinful man, dying impenitent and unbelieving, can have no rest of soul, his conscience will lash him, and he will be under condemnation and torment in Hades, until Christ is presented to him. Only when, in view of the Saviour of sinners, he repents and believes, can he be rescued from the appalling effects of his sins, and feel the peace of God.

Whatever subject this Father of American Universalism discussed, he was sure to come round, at last, to his pet theme, the universality of the gospel, and what he believed to be its logical implications. He had these on the brain. In reading many a page of his voluminous writings, one can easily imagine that he is reading an editorial in the *Andover Review*. Much of his phraseology was the same as that employed by those who now advocate similar views, and use the same arguments. As to the precise time beyond death when Christ will be revealed to all men, he was not positive. He used to say, as the Andover Professors now say, that as to the times and seasons he was not absolutely certain. But at some period beyond death, he was sure, Christ, in his redeeming love and mighty power to save, would be made known to all men. He was strongly inclined to believe that this "period," as he called it, will be that of the general judgment.

Upon the question, therefore, of opportunity for all men, either in this life or the next, to know Christ and be saved by him, the Andover Professors and John Murray are in perfect accord. The dogma that there is to be a probation after death, the Progressive Divines of to-day as truly hold and teach as did the "progressive" Father of American Universalism one hundred years ago. This belief of the present Andover Professors was an essential and dominant part of that very Universalism which was preached by its ablest advocate in Boston, through New England,

in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, at the very time when, and for a quarter of a century before, Andover Seminary was founded.

We have now, as we believe, amply substantiated four of our Complaints against some of the beliefs and teachings of Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, D.D. We think we have shown conclusively, by evidence and argument, that the Professor, in accepting and promulgating the New Theology, or Progressive Orthodoxy, believes, maintains and inculcates :

I. That the Bible is not the "only perfect rule of faith and practice," but is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings.

II. That Christ, in the days of his humiliation, was a finite being, limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments: in other words, was not "*God and Man*."

III. That no man has power or capacity to repent without knowledge of God in Christ.

VI. That the atonement of Christ consists essentially and chiefly in his becoming identified with the human race in his incarnation, in order that, by his union with men, He might endow them with power to repent, and thus impart to them an augmented value in the view of God, and so render God propitious towards them.

We also submit, that we have proved, that all these beliefs, theories and speculations are held, maintained and inculcated by the Professor, in utter violation of the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary, and in sharp antagonism to the requirements of the Seminary Creed.

Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, — I have said what I have largely because of my responsibility as a Trustee. It is not in my heart to injure in any respect, or in the least degree, any Professor in the Seminary. But what right have our two Boards to disregard the known will of the Founders, and prove ourselves false to a large, public and sacred trust, in the interest personal and private of a few men? We have a trust committed to us, one of the smallest items of which is a million and a half of property. The interests committed to us of sound theological learning, of the true gospel, and of the Kingdom of Christ are immeasurable. Now what right have we to give consent to a breach of this *great trust*, out of regard to the interest, or the assumed right, of the Profess-

ors in their salaries? If the learned counsel of the Professor could defend the right of their client to his salary, could they also defend our Boards of Trustees and Visitors against the charge of committing an immeasurable crime, if we allow the Seminary and all its future evangelical interests and influence to be sacrificed to the personal and temporary convenience of half a dozen men?

It is a smaller matter, and yet worthy of our notice, that the departure of Professors in our Seminary from the faith which the Institution was founded to maintain, is no longer concealed. It has become notorious. The reputation of the Seminary is suffering. The number of students is greatly diminished. Indeed the number was never so small in the history of the Institution, as it has been since the New Departure began. Never was the Seminary so well endowed for a large work, yet never was it doing a work so small, and of such a kind, as it has been doing since the Seminary year, 1881-82. Thoughtful and honest men are looking on aghast. The public conviction is that there is a great breach of trust here.

Andover Seminary was founded by men who were moved by indignation at the alleged perversion of funds at Cambridge. Mr. Hollis provided that the Hollis Professor should be an "orthodox" man. But no one can tell exactly what he meant by an orthodox man. He did not define his meaning by preparing an elaborate Creed. Very little is known of Mr. Hollis, or of the type of his orthodoxy. But the Founders of Andover Seminary took eight months to define what they meant by an orthodox man. Moreover the Hollis Fund was small. Yet many regarded the alleged perversion of that small sum as infamous. Must a similar infamy be attached to Andover, and become as much more notorious in history as the funds here are larger? Spotless should be the reputation of a Theological Seminary. This sacred Institution is educating young men to be put in trust with the gospel of Christ. They should have before them constantly an example of the most scrupulous honesty on the part of the Professors in subscribing to the Creed and fulfilling promises; and also of the staunchest fidelity to trusts in all the management of this Christian Institution under its Boards of Trustees and Visitors. Questions are asked, and hints are given in the public prints, secular as well as religious, to which our two Boards cannot longer be indifferent. The Alumni of the Seminary are alarmed and pained. Remarks are often made in private which make every friend of Andover blush for shame.

Other similar judgments have been publicly pronounced. I make no charge of conscious dishonesty against anybody. But the position which the Professors have taken is morally indefensible. They cannot stand where they are in the face of honest men. Nor — I may say it in this presence without offence, for I offend myself if anybody, in saying it — nor can the Board of Trustees, or the Board of Visitors, stand behind, and in support of, these Professors any longer in the face of honest men. For one I cannot do it, and I will not do it, without uttering, as I now do, before this Board, before the world, and before heaven, my solemn protest against this monstrous wrong. This affair has become scandalous. But is Andover to be made infamous? Is her very name — so dear to thousands, and so long a symbol of purity — now to be blackened? Is her honor, till recently borne aloft fair and spotless, to be henceforth trailed, torn, and trodden in the dirt, dragged in the wake of a gigantic breach of trust? These questions can be avoided no longer. They must be answered, and answered now.

With you, Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, is the authority to decide the issue raised. And, therefore, I appeal to you. Others present will give their own views of the case, and present their own pleas. For myself, in the name of the Founders of this sacred and noble Institution, so far as I may be permitted to represent them, in the name of all but the smallest fraction of the Alumni, both the living and the sainted; in the name of common honesty and honorableness; in the name of divine truth and righteousness; and, above all, in the name of Him whose glorious Gospel and Kingdom Andover was founded to defend and to extend over the world — I do solemnly protest against the theological revolution now in process, and pushed forward in violation of sacred promises, in defiance of deeds of trust, of the Creed itself, and of the Constitution and Statutes of the Seminary.

ARGUMENT OF REV. O. T. LANPHEAR, D.D.

Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors:

1. I ASK your attention to the seventh charge of the list, viz. : .

We charge that Prof. Egbert C. Smyth holds, maintains and inculcates: that, *The Trinity is modal, or monarchian, and not a Trinity of Persons.*

We do not mean to say that Progressive Orthodoxy teaches the monarchian or the modal *theory* of the Trinity, but it teaches what is nearer to the monarchian or the modal theory of the Trinity than the Calvinistic doctrine of the Trinity. It denies that Christ is the immutable God, and thus is utterly irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Trinity as expressed in the Creed. It is not so utterly irreconcilable with the monarchian or Arian Theory. The Andover Creed states that "in the Godhead are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: and that these Three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." It also states that "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

Now the Andover Creed has been explained from the beginning as meaning that the Father may say of himself "I am God immutable, infinite. The Son may say the same of himself, and the Holy Spirit may say the same of himself." Now the Progressive Orthodoxy denies that Christ while on the earth could say of himself, I am God immutable. In both his human and divine nature he was once ignorant. He was finite in all his attributes. Hence, if he ever was infinite, he was changed into the finite. If he was changed once, he might be changed again. He is not immutable. Then there is not a Trinity of three immutable Persons or hypostases. These three hypostases may be modal, but they cannot be each of them immutable, for one of them has been finite in power

and wisdom. God may exist as one infinite Person, and this is the monarchian theory, but he cannot exist as three infinite and immutable hypostases according to the Calvinistic theory. Hence the modal, or monarchian theory may be true, but the Calvinistic theory cannot be true.

What we have to say in sustaining this charge, we desire for the sake of brevity, to put in a series of propositions :

I. The Progressive Orthodoxy does not in so many words deny that there are three hypostases in the Godhead, the same in substance and equal in power and glory.

II. The Progressive Orthodoxy affirms that while Christ was on earth, He was not infinite in power and wisdom, and was not immutable.

[*Prog. Orth.* pp. 227, 228] :—

“But our implicit acceptance of Christ’s teachings is an essential part of Christian faith.” Yes, and has evangelical Biblical science come into antagonism with any teaching of Christ in its assertions about the composition or structure of the Old Testament? “He has ascribed the Pentateuch to Moses, and the later chapters of Isaiah to the prophet called by that name.” No, He has made no such ascription. He has in quotation followed the Jewish habit of naming the book from its reputed author. It is a fair question as to whether, in the act of speaking, the person of the author was before his mind. Certainly He had no thought of making the fact of authorship a part of his teaching. One might as well claim that a minister commits himself to the view that all the book ascribed to Isaiah was written by that prophet, in saying to a congregation that he will read a chapter from the book of Isaiah. And even if one is convinced that our Lord accepted the traditional view of the authorship of the books in question, he cannot hold that His authority is committed to that view until he has satisfied himself that Christ claimed to be omniscient during the days of his humiliation, — a belief irreconcilable with his own declaration that He knew neither the day nor the hour of his second coming.

[*Andover Review*, May 1886, p. 522] :—

The limitations to which his humanity subjected Him are recognized ; but as the glorified Christ, He is delocalized, unlimited, is with his Church away unto the end of the world.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 32, as cited under V.]

III. After Christ ascended to heaven this second hypostasis became infinite in power and wisdom. Although ignorant on earth, he was not ignorant in heaven.

[*Andover Review*, May 1886, p. 522, as cited under II.]

IV. Progressive Orthodoxy says, the three hypostases are not three persons in a philosophical sense, but are only one person. [*Prog. Orth.* p. 59]:—

Christ brings God the Person to man the person, and in such manner that God is known as the God of holy love, the loving and holy Father.

In the answer filed under Particular 7. — Prof. Smyth says:—

If by the phrase "Trinity of Persons" is meant that the one absolute person, God, exists as three persons; person being used in each member of the sentence with the same meaning, I admit that I do not hold such a doctrine.

No exception is here taken to this answer. It is cited to show that he believes in "the one absolute person God," as stated in this proposition.

V. According to Progressive Orthodoxy the second of these hypostases before the Incarnation, was not a person in the philosophical sense.

[*Prog. Orth.* pp. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32]:—

1. We start, therefore, with a conception of the human nature of Christ as created by the Word and Son of God for the realization in finite form of that which is his own personal characteristic, as created to express his truth and grace, and to share with Him in his Father's love. In its very idea and essence the human nature of Christ is adapted to such a purpose. It is finite, and the Word who created it is infinite. But we do not move in our thinking, if we think correctly on this subject, merely on this plane of contrasts. We may not forget them, but they are only a part of the truth. The divine and human natures in Christ are essentially related to each other. *The human nature is the divine nature humanly expressed and realized.* The one should be as closely connected with the other in our conception as a word with the thought it utters. The thought is unexpressed without the word. The word is empty save as it is the bearer of the thought. The relation is as intimate as this, but it is of a higher kind. A word is a breath, a transient, fugitive thing. Christ's human nature is a real image of the divine Word. That Word has personality. His word which He utters in creating the human soul of Christ is personal. The human nature of Christ is in finite form the personal word of that eternal Word. It is not a foreign nature. If it were we could not possibly retain at once its integrity and its personal union with the divine nature. The new and fundamental thought in modern Christology is the essential relation of the two natures, so that either can know and realize itself in the other. This being apprehended, the standing difficulty with the doctrine is, if not removed, so reduced that it ceases to be an objection.

2. This brings us to our second point, the act of incarnation as constitutive of the Unity of Christ's Person. We have, as elements of the union,

the divine nature as possessed by the Logos, or in that mode of being which characterizes his existence, and an ideally perfect humanity. Such a human nature must be personal. The divine nature in the Logos also is personal. Yet neither in itself is a person. The Logos is a person only with, in, and through the Father and the Spirit. The human nature is a person only with, in, and through the Logos. The central point of Christ's personality falls into the central point of Absolute Personality. Otherwise a person would be the object of supreme worship exterior to and additional to the one only God. Recent writers who have derived the personality of Christ from the human nature, or else have made it simply a resultant of the union of natures, have not duly guarded this point. They have had a truth at heart, the vindication of the reality of Jesus's humanity. An impersonal human nature, they have seen, is something defective and unreal. But in recovering this essential truth, it is not necessary to go to either of the extremes just indicated. The constitutive act for Christ's Person is the union of two natures. One of these, the human, is only potentially personal, and is capable, by its very constitution, of entering into a divine life, of finding the truth of its existence in God. The other is a particular mode of the divine being, not in itself a person, but the bearer of a personal principle, and capable of self-realization in a human life. The act of incarnation is the union of these two.

3. The self-consciousness of Jesus. We have noticed before what it is as disclosed to us in the evangelical narratives. We consider it now in its basis and necessary form.

All our experiences arise from our constitution as embodied spirits, and our entire consciousness reflects this union of body and soul. So Christ's history has for its foundation the union of two natures. His personality presupposes this union. It is formative for his life and consciousness, just as the constitution of the soul in union with the body is the foundation of its history. The analogy is not perfect, but in both cases alike two elements without confusion or loss of properties are so united as to be the germ of a development. The personality of Christ existed primarily as a latent power, as does all other human personality. And as the basis was complex, so the unfolding consciousness; never simply divine, never merely human; never the two in addition, or collocation, or separation, the one remaining unaffected by the other; never confused, blended, interchanged. That which is divine shines in and through what is human; that which is human possesses and therefore can reveal what is divine. It is like the union in physics of force and matter, only without there being on either side inertia. It is like the union of reason and understanding in rational thought, only it is far higher than a harmony of faculties. The divine nature and the human interpenetrate each the other. The divine informs the human. The human receives and expresses the divine. The one in condescending love and sympathy makes every thing belonging to the other its own. The latter apprehends whatever the former has as its own good, the truth, the perfection in which it finds its own fulfilment. And of this process, which is ever reciprocal, there is in consciousness a centre. It is the personality of the creative Word, but not simply this. It is the personality of the created nature, but not merely this. It is the one as affected by the other. It is the

latter fulfilled in the former. It is that point of rest and union, and therefore of life and power, where the divine nature realizes the experiences of the human as its own, where the human realizes that its completeness and perfection are in God. It is the centre of a divine-human consciousness, and this personal centre is the God-Man.

This personality was not fully realized in the beginning. There was not only growth of the humanity of Jesus, but a progressive union with the divine. Here is the truth in the theories of the Kenotists, who maintain that the Word, at the Incarnation, laid aside, or suspended the exercise of, his attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and the like. This is but a clumsy and somewhat violent and unethical method of appropriating certain undeniable facts; such as the limitation of Jesus's knowledge, the perfect human reality of his earthly life, the veritable growth of his consciousness and personality from the moment of the Incarnation. The Incarnation itself, though real at the beginning, was also a process which had steps which the records of Jesus's life enable us in some degree to trace and understand. At every stage his history had a meaning for himself. Not only his birth, but his visit to the Temple, his baptism, his temptation, transfiguration, crucifixion, resurrection, were epochs in his consciousness, events fraught with meaning and new powers for his own Person.

VI. Progressive Orthodoxy says that the second of these hypotheses took to himself human nature, and then the divine nature and the human nature became a person in the philosophical sense.

[See citations under V., also *Prog. Orth.* pp. 22, 23]:—

The Word became flesh not at Jesus's baptism, not at his resurrection or ascension, but this was the beginning of his life, that the second Person of the Trinity was *made* in the likeness of man, so that it was predicted that the holy thing which should be born should be *called the Son of God*, and the Son of the Virgin should be named Immanuel; and when the event occurred it was announced to the shepherds: "There is born to you this day . . . a Saviour which is Christ the Lord;" and wise men, guided by the star, blended their rejoicings with those of the heavenly host, and when they saw the young child fell down and worshipped Him. Make of these accounts what we may, they are the fitting beginning of the historic life that then appeared, and its only adequate premise, as Origen long ago discerned. And if we pursue the narrative in either of the Gospels we constantly observe the same phenomena. The evidences of a complete human nature multiply as we read, but not less manifest is the one Person who is the centre to which all attributes and acts are ever referred; and so wondrously adjusted is all this that, in reviewing the history of the reception which these accounts have received from the great mass of readers, nothing is more striking and nothing more uniform than the conviction which has prevailed that, from the manger to the cross and from the cross to the throne, it is one and only one Person who lived, suffered, died, and was believed to have risen from the tomb and to have ascended on high.

VII. According to this representation there are in the Godhead two persons in the philosophical sense. The three hypostases form one person, and the second hypostasis with the human nature united form another person. Jesus Christ having a divine and human nature is a person in the philosophical sense ; but the Father by himself is not a person in the philosophical sense, neither is the Holy Ghost.

VIII. God is immutable, but Christ having a divine and human nature is mutable. God is omniscient, but Christ having a divine and human nature is ignorant, therefore Christ having a divine and human nature, is not God.

According to the view of the framers of the Seminary Creed the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ was such that He was *conscious* of himself as human, and also *conscious* of himself as divine. In this union it was not supposed that He lost any of his attributes as divine ; or that the humanity of Christ lost any of its attributes. Thus he could speak as divine and therefore as God, Omniscient ; or He could speak as a man and therefore ignorant of some things. But *Progressive Orthodoxy* does not allow that he could be thus conscious of himself, or that the person of Christ admits of such a distinction.

IX. The *Progressive Orthodoxy* [pp. 227, 228 as cited under II.] alludes to the fact that Christ while on earth did not know the time of his second coming. The allusion implies that Christ in both his divine and human nature was ignorant of this fact. Now if the *whole* person of Christ was thus ignorant on earth, he certainly was not thus ignorant before he came to the earth. Here then was a wonderful and a radical change from his divine omniscience to a small degree of knowledge.

Again in the same paragraph [pp. 227, 228,] the same volume implies that perhaps Christ during his earthly residence did not know who wrote the Pentateuch. Now if Christ was God *before* the incarnation, he had an agency in inspiring the author, or authors of the Pentateuch. At that period he knew the authorship of these five books. If at a subsequent period the same hypostasis did not know this authorship, then the hypostasis underwent an essential mutation from knowledge to ignorance, and was not while on earth, the God recognized in the Creed of the Seminary. He was a person like that whom the Arians recognize as the Messiah.

It is far easier to reconcile the doctrine of the Progressive Orthodoxy with the Arian doctrine, than with the Orthodox Trinita-

rian doctrine. It has such a theory with regard to the three hypostases that it confounds us, and we do not know but the monarchian or modal theory is the true one, but we do know that the Orthodox theory is not the true one, if the book is correct.

X. Every Professor in Andover Seminary makes the solemn declaration, that he will maintain the truth in opposition to the Arians, and the Sabellians; but the Progressive Orthodoxy does not oppose the Arians and the Sabellians, in some of their distinctive views regarding Jesus Christ as he lived upon the earth. It favors some of those distinctive views.

XI. The Andover Creed states that the three hypostases in the Godhead are the same in substance and equal in every divine perfection.

Now, if the second hypostasis can cease to be infinite in power and wisdom, so, for aught we know, can the first and the third hypostases. The three hypostases may become finite at one and the same time. It is easy to see that all such ideas diminish the majesty of God, and we know that the founders of Andover Seminary were distinguished for their exalted views of the three hypostases whom they exalted as immutable and infinite in power and wisdom; it is also easy to see that these three hypostases must be modal rather than personal in the biblical sense. Christ on earth could not have said, "I am infinite, I am omnipotent, I am omniscient." Peter could not properly have said to Him, "Thou knowest all things."

If the three hypostases may cease to be infinite—since if the second may, all may, on account of their equality; so that there is only the one absolute Person, God—then it must appear that the three hypostases do not denote three eternal, ontological distinctions in the Godhead. They are only convenient phrases for describing the different modes of God's action and manifestation. But this is the modal theory of Sabellius, and not according to the Andover Creed.

There is a tendency in *Progressive Orthodoxy* to exalt the human in Christ unduly by rationalistic interpretation [as on p. 111]:

The question back of all is as old as the gospel itself. It was first asked by our Lord when He inquired, "Who do men say that the SON OF MAN is?" As of old the answer has been insufficient. One of the prophets, an Elijah, a Jeremiah, one sent to a favored part, but to only a part of this sinful world. The Master's searching question comes closer: "But who say ye that I am?" The answer was in the question as He first asked it. He is the SON OF MAN.

But Peter did not answer the question as first asked, but he said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," not merely the "Son of Man." And Christ blessed Peter for his answer, declaring that he had been guided in that answer by revelation from the Father. The excellence of Peter's answer, is, that it brings out both the human and the divine nature of the Lord: the Christ, the Messiah the Son of David; and the Son of the living God, the Eternal Son of God. So Alford, Lange and Schaff. (Matth. 16: 13-17.) To say then that the proper answer is, that, "He is the Son of Man," is to exalt the human at the expense of the divine; which is all the more to be regretted because it involves an error in exegesis.

XII. As the *Progressive Orthodoxy* opposes both the letter and the spirit of the Andover Creed in regard to the person of Christ, so it opposes the Creed in regard to the whole doctrine of the Trinity; and it favors such views of Christ while on earth as are more in sympathy with Arianism and Sabellianism than with Calvinism. It breaks down the doctrine of Christ's immutable divinity, and thus breaks down the doctrine of the Seminary Creed in regard to the Trinity.

XIII. *Progressive Orthodoxy* favors monarchianism so far as this, it affirms that the Godhead consists of only one person, and that the three hypostases were not during Christ's residence on earth all of them immutable, and equal to each other in power. We do not deny that according to the book the divine and the human nature of Christ on earth formed a distinct Person, but this distinct Person who died on the cross was not in the language of the Creed, God, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power. We think that the volume has committed a fundamental error in undertaking to explain the adorable mysteries of the Godhead.

We therefore claim that Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, as being the composer of *Progressive Orthodoxy* and of the *Andover Review*, does hold, maintain and inculcate that the Trinity is modal, or monarchian, and not a Trinity of Persons.

2. We further charge that Prof. Egbert C. Smyth, holds, maintains and inculcates, that, *The work of the Holy Spirit is chiefly confined to the sphere of historic Christianity.*

The article of the Seminary Creed which every professor is required to subscribe is this:—

"I believe that regeneration and sanctification are effects of the creating and renewing agency of the Holy Spirit, and that supreme love to God constitutes the essential difference between saints and sinners; that by convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds, working faith in us, and renewing our wills, the Holy Spirit makes us partakers of the benefits of redemption."

To show that in *Progressive Orthodoxy* the work of the Holy Spirit is chiefly confined to the sphere of historic Christianity we quote the following passages.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 116]:—

For the sake of distinctness we state our position in the following postulates:—

1. The work of the Holy Spirit, as a work in *motive*, fulfils and makes effective the method of salvation proposed by Christianity.
2. Historic Christianity alone offers sufficient *material* in motive, in the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord, for the natural and efficacious work of the Holy Spirit.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 119]:—

What we wish to affirm and maintain is simply the Scriptural position that Christianity is the religion of motive, a fact of which the presence of the Holy Spirit is the unmistakable sign, and to which his work bears perpetual testimony.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 123]:—

As the coming of Christ involved the gift of the Spirit, even to the disclosure of his personality, the designation of his offices, and the assurance of his abiding presence in the world, so the gift of the Spirit seems to us to presuppose the new facts, the new relationships, the new motives, which centre around the Person of Christ.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 121]:—

What we know as the dispensation of the Spirit follows and depends upon the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord. The order is not simply that of sequence: it is that of dependence. First the revelation of God in Christ, then, and in consequence, the communication of the life of God through the Spirit.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 129]:—

We conclude, then, that the work of the Holy Spirit is distinctively a Christian work; that it follows in the order of dependence upon the revelation of God in Christ; that it draws its argument from the Person and work of the Redeemer; and that it proceeds from and toward Christ in the renewal of the life of the individual and in the renovation of society.

Now, in citing these passages, we admit that there are other passages, in which the presence of motive in the facts of nature is not denied, nor the agency of the Spirit of God in the use of these facts; nor the existence of regenerate life outside of Christianity.

But, with these admissions, we say that the work of the Holy Spirit cannot in truth be limited in any manner to Historic Christianity; meaning by that, the life, death and resurrection of our Lord:—

I. We argue this first, from the fact that in so far as the Holy Spirit works by motive He works by Divine Truth. In the prayer of our Lord for the sanctification of his disciples, he said, — “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth:”¹ i.e., the whole Word of God, that in the Old Testament as well as that in the New. — In the 19th Psalm, 7th verse, it is said, “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” It should be remembered, that the Bible makes no distinction between conversion and regeneration. The Holy Spirit uses the whole Word of God as motive, the word of Law as well as the word of Gospel. In making the *former* Scriptures the means of enlightening the authors of the *later* Scriptures, the Holy Spirit established the continuity of his own teaching and built the Church “upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,”² amalgamating the two foundations into one. So St. Paul says to Timothy, “The Holy Scriptures [of the Old Testament] are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Jesus Christ.”³ The force of the expression lies in the *making wise*. The Gospel, Timothy has already received; the faith in Christ Jesus, he already has; and therefore he is in actual possession of the salvation; but the *wisdom* appertaining to this salvation he is to seek by means of the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

It has been well said that in the Old Testament there is the Promised Christ; the Typical Christ; and the Christ of Prophecy: while in the New Testament there is the Christ incarnate of the four Gospels; the preached Christ of the Acts; the Doctrinal Christ of the Epistles; and the Christ with his Church triumphant in the Revelation. There is the Christ of the Old Testament as well as the Christ of the New. It was through the Old Testament that Christ taught his disciples personally after his resurrection. “He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. And he said unto them⁴ O foolish men and slow

¹ John 17: 17.

² Eph. 2: 20.

³ 2 Tim. 3: 15.

⁴ Luke 24: 27, 45-47.

of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken ! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory ? And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Again "he said unto them these are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning me. Then opened he their mind that they might understand the Scriptures : and he said unto them thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day."

Now, it is evident that that which the Lord, before his departure, did by word of mouth, is precisely that which after his departure, was done by the Holy Ghost : then — the *Holy Ghost* "opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures."

Now, in this view, as it is affirmed in the Creed of the Seminary, that the word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice ; so it must be said that the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, must be considered as furnishing material in motive for the work of the Holy Spirit. But, it is in opposition to this to say, as in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, that *Historic Christianity alone* offers sufficient material in motive for the natural and efficacious work of the Holy Spirit.

Besides, it must be considered in respect to prophecy, that taking prophecy as *predicated fact*, it must stand in the same relation to doctrine as is held by *history* or *recorded fact*. When the promise was made to Abraham that in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed, the promise was made as a prophecy, in the form of *predicated facts* ; not to become historic and recorded facts until the promise shall have been fulfilled. But though not yet historic facts, and being only predicated facts of prophecy, yet, Abraham believed in them, and his faith in them as declared by the Word of God was accounted to him for righteousness. So in the New Testament there is undoubtedly prophecy as *predicated fact* — fact which cannot become *historic* and *recorded fact* until at length in the future it shall be fulfilled ; which predicated fact is nevertheless a part of God's word, and goes to make up the only perfect rule of faith, and also to make up the motive for the work of the Holy Spirit.

But this predicated fact of prophecy is not taken into account, when it is said, as in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, that Historic Christianity *alone* offers sufficient material in motive, in the *life, death,* and *resurrection* of our Lord for the natural and efficacious work of the Holy Spirit.

II. In the second place there is in the work of the Holy Spirit as affirmed in the Creed of the Seminary, a creating and renewing agency of which we fail to find any proper recognition in *Progressive Orthodoxy*. It is said in the citation (p. 119) that "Christianity is the religion of motive, a fact of which the presence of the Holy Spirit is the unmistakable sign." This it would seem must mean, taken with postulate (No. 2, p. 116), that the Holy Spirit works only by *motive*, and that therefore his work is a *natural* work, and that in so working his work is efficacious. The question therefore rises here, whether it is intended to exclude the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit? It is said indeed, in the citation made from the 129th page, that "the work of the Holy Spirit draws its argument from the Person and Work of the Redeemer; and that it proceeds from and toward Christ in the *renewal* of the life of the individual." — But is this *renewal* of the life of the individual in any sense a supernatural work of the Holy Spirit? Is it instantaneous, or is it to be understood as a natural and gradual process in the development of Christian character? Some answer to this question is given [*Prog. Orth.* p. 126]:—

And if now we turn to the renewing and transforming work of the Spirit within the soul we find the same direct relation to Christ. As before Christ was the argument, now He is the pattern. The Spirit works toward Christ in the reconstruction of character. It is enough to say of his work that it is in the endeavor to make men over into Christians. The end is actual and manifest likeness to Christ. Regeneration thus acquires a large and an exact meaning under Christianity.

In this renewing and transforming work of the Spirit within the soul we find no intimation of the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit. He takes Christ as the Pattern. The Spirit works toward Christ as the Pattern in the reconstruction of character. It is enough to say of his work that it is in the endeavor to make men over into Christians; while the end is the actual and manifest likeness to Christ. This is called regeneration; a regeneration which acquires a large and exact meaning under Christianity.

Now, while there may be something in this conformable to the work of sanctification, we fail to see in this any thing of regeneration according to the intention of the Seminary Creed. It is said there, that regeneration and sanctification are effects of the *creating* and *renewing* agency of the Holy Spirit. The meaning is that regeneration is an instantaneous work. The men who framed and were interested in the Creed of the Seminary believed that God the Holy Spirit was the sole Author of regeneration; the first mover of it; the sole director of all other agencies in the work; and that sole Author, implied a direct and immediate interposition in the work. Thus they regarded regeneration as a *special* work of God.

But in opposition to this view of regeneration in the Seminary Creed, regeneration is represented in *Progressive Orthodoxy* as a gradual work, as the imitation of Christ as the pattern under the influence of the Holy Spirit working on the soul by motive; the Spirit working toward Christ in the reconstruction of character.

According to the Creed, the Holy Spirit uses all of Divine truth, as influence, and instrument, and motive; while at the same time, he has supernatural agency over and above motive, and over and above the influence of truth.

In opposition to this supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit, *Progressive Orthodoxy* lays stress upon "the *natural* work of the Holy Spirit." So *Prog. Orth.* [p. 122]:—

The knowledge of Christ precedes and is necessary to the natural work of the Holy Spirit.

So *Prog. Orth.* [p. 116]: The work of the Holy Spirit is a *natural* work.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 129.] The question is asked:—

How could the Spirit of God develop without the aid of Christianity those working principles for the renovation of society, which men would recognize as sufficient, and to which they could surrender themselves with enthusiasm?

As though the Holy Spirit had no power besides that in which he works as an *influence* attending truth, as limited to the life, death, and resurrection of our Lord; and that, as a natural influence by motive, for the renovation of society!

It is here left out of account that God by His sovereignty makes

a motive effective, which has been rejected and ineffectual in the natural mode of influence. Thus, the Holy Spirit may work according to motive in the natural method. He may assist conscience to do its work in a further degree than it would do if the conscience were left to itself. He may act upon the minds of men in many ways, by exciting thought in them, and by assisting their natural reason and understanding; but in the renewing and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, those things are wrought in the soul that are above nature, and of which there is nothing of the like kind in the soul by nature. In this supernatural agency, the Holy Spirit does not use any means that operate by their own power, or natural force, but he works not *mediately*, but *immediately*. By this agency of the Holy Spirit society is renovated much in proportion to the number in it who have become the subjects of renewing grace: and this too when without this supernatural work of the Spirit society would not be renovated at all, so as to come in possession of a deep and lasting purpose for righteousness.

To us, the whole Book of *Progressive Orthodoxy* is pervaded with rationalistic principles, to the utter neglect of the Scriptures. Therefore, we believe that against Prof. Egbert C. Smyth as the editor, composer, and publisher of this book, the charge is sustained:—viz.: that he holds, maintains and inculcates, contrary to the Creed of the Seminary, that the work of the Holy Spirit is chiefly confined to the sphere of historic Christianity.

3. We further charge that Prof. Egbert C. Smyth holds, maintains and inculcates: *That faith ought to be scientific and rational, rather than Scriptural.*

The declaration in respect to faith which every Professor in the Seminary is obliged by statute to make and subscribe is as follows, viz.:

I believe that the Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.

This faith is credit given to the testimony of the Scriptures as being the Word of God, as having the authority of God. Thus received, "the Bible is to the theologian what nature is to the man of science, it is his storehouse of facts." By classifying the facts of Scripture, and by induction from them, the theologian is able to formulate the doctrines which the Scriptures teach in the

harmony of a system. Thus the theologian, who takes the Scriptures as the only perfect rule of faith and practice, takes the Christian system of doctrines precisely as it is given in the Scriptures, without being diverted by any side references to particular philosophical schools, or by any assumptions of science external to the Scriptures, or by any demands of the human reason external to the Scriptures; and because the Scriptures as the revelation of the Eternal Mind take the place of the human reason within the sphere of Christian doctrine. Now we observe:

I. That, as opposed to Scriptural faith, it is said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 8]:—

There is no doctrine of the Bible, however rudimentary and essential, which is not susceptible of illumination or higher systemization in the development of a scientific faith.

But Scriptural faith is not the result of scientific development, nor scientific, for in that case it must be “conformed to the rules of science.” By science, faith is the result of logical induction, so that scientific demonstration is independent of the will, and is demonstrative only in so far as it is compulsory on the mind. The existence of God is not susceptible of a scientific demonstration, and Scripture so represents it, for, it commands us to believe in one God; but all commands relate to the will. The safeguard of Scriptural faith is the right state of the heart, by which the obedience of the will is secured, but a scientific faith has no safeguard in its appeal to the mind, in respect to Scripture truth; for what may seem to be a demonstration to one mind will seem to be no demonstration to another mind, and because the subjects of Scriptural faith are above the capacity of reason and beyond the reach of scientific demonstration. Any attempt to make Scriptural faith scientific in method tends to destroy it.

II. As opposed to Scriptural faith, it is said that we cannot tell what the Bible is, without referring to another revelation which God has given in history: i.e. the account which the Bible gives of itself is not sufficient. God has revealed himself in the Bible, and has also given a revelation in history by which we are to learn what the Bible is. By this it appears that the Bible of itself could not be the “only perfect rule of faith and practice.”

Thus in answer to the question "What is the Bible?" — it is said: —

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 192]: —

We can know just what the Bible is from revelation, if we have a revelation about the matter. Is this in our possession? No; for the Scriptures (to Christians the depository of revelation whatever else they may be) do not undertake to tell how they arose, how they were collected into one sacred volume, or precisely what they are. The exact conception of their distinctive qualities which by general consent belongs to complete Christian knowledge they do not profess to give.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 193]: —

We are therefore driven back to a study of these Scriptures, (O. T.) as well as of those of the later Canon, in the historical evidences of their origin and nature.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 195]: —

We must seek, then, knowledge of the distinctive quality and value of the Scriptures by studying God's revelation given in history. A collection of literature is before us, — ideas and narratives conveyed by human minds to other minds in human language. As Christians we recognize qualities in these ideas and narratives which are wanting to other literature. We wish to obtain a knowledge of these qualities as exact as possible, and try to find out what distinguished their authors from other men that they could write such books.

Now, this study of history upon scientific methods, in order to determine what it was that distinguished the sacred writers from other men that they could write such books, is objectionable because it may lead to the conclusion that they were not different from other men, and that they could not have written what their words taken by themselves upon a fair exegesis plainly indicate; that, considering the age in which they lived as to civilization, and the culture they received, they could not be supposed to have written what their words signify as interpreted by themselves. Thus the sacred contents of the Scriptures must suffer abatement as testimony to be received by faith, to suit whatever caprice of the so-called science of history or philosophy happens to be in fashion.

Besides, this inquiry into what distinguished the sacred writers from other men, in historic sources is not necessary. It is of no consequence that we do not know the authors of the principles of Geometry which Euclid is said to have collected and systematized; nor what led to the discovery of these principles, whether for the re-survey of lands on the Nile after each inundation, or for archi-

tectural or astronomical use. The truth is contained in the contents of the Elements of Pure Geometry, independent of the age in which they were discovered, or the peculiarities of the persons who discovered them: so that in all time to come men who may have no knowledge historically of Euclid, Archimedes or Apollonius, are fully persuaded of the truths of Geometry. So in a manner analogous, though with more certainty, as to the truth of the Scriptures as the only perfect rule of faith and practice, as contained in the Scriptures themselves.

III. The treatment of inspiration in *Progressive Orthodoxy* dwarfs the Scriptures, and thus opposes the Creed of the Seminary. The saying of Hopkins that "the Scriptures were composed under the direction and superintendency of the Holy Ghost, the authors being inspired by him"¹ is substantially denied in *Progressive Orthodoxy*:

That the inspiration of the Bible denotes such an influence upon the minds of the writers of the Bible as caused them to write in the best manner: that it was inspiration of superintendency, direction, suggestion and revelation: that by inspiration there was communicated to the minds of the sacred penmen such truths as were important for them to know, and such as would not, or could not otherwise have come to their knowledge.

All which is necessary in order that the Bible should be the only perfect rule of faith and practice: is substantially denied in *Progressive Orthodoxy*.

We say *substantially*, for we do not mean to say that any thing is said on this subject with such carefulness in method, and consistency of statement, that it can properly be referred to as a *theory*, or a *view*, of inspiration. Besides, the treatment of this, as of other subjects in this book is so obscure, through its mysticism, as to preclude, in many instances, clearness and consistency of thought.

It is obvious enough however, that all communication of ideas, such as could not otherwise come to the knowledge of the sacred writers, is here rejected. The revelation by the sacred writers was rather such as would flow in a rational manner from their personal vitality, as a part of their personal experience, so that while, in some sense, the Holy Spirit imparted to them a supernatural gift, the *use* of this gift was only by a rationalistic method, so that the writers expressed only what came within the limits of their own personal experience.

¹ *System*, vol. 1, p. 19.

It said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 198] : —

The assumption of a special activity of the Divine Spirit upon the apostles and other writers of Scripture in the act of composition, endowing what came from their pens with qualities possessed by no other Christian teaching, is a most fruitful source of confusion in the endeavor to find out what Scripture is.

This is said in this connection by comparison of what was written by the apostles, with their oral teaching, but it is plainly the intention to reject the special aid of the Spirit in either case.

It is further said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 200] : —

The apostles were the bearers of a revelation made immediately to each of them by the Spirit of God. Of the fact of such revelation they were conscious; by their consciousness of it the form of their teaching is moulded. We turn to their religious life and study this wonderful experience in the light of their own testimony, in the hope of gaining such a knowledge of it as shall lead to an adequate conception of the nature of the teaching which flowed from it. The fundamental characteristic of the revelation borne by each apostle was its vitality. It was an essential part of the spiritual life. The gift received by the infant Church on Pentecost was not merely the bestowal of this or that capacity; it was that of living in a new and higher way.

Again [*Prog. Orth.* p. 201] : —

The revelation of which each apostle was the bearer is not, therefore, to be thought of as a set of religious ideas made over to him to be held as an external possession. The man could not be himself without having it; he could not give it without giving his life with it. For it was in essence a personal experience of Jesus Christ in and through whom he lived.

Again [*Prog. Orth.* p. 204] : —

Our reverence for man is such that we can easily believe the best medium for conveying God's truth to the world to be a human life filled and inspired by this truth. And when we come under the influence of the apostolic letters we feel that *their vitality* penetrating the truth is of the very essence of their disclosing power. It is not so much that we draw ideas about God out of them, as that we touch God himself in them, because the life with which they palpitate is fed in its central springs by his own. It is not merely in what they *say* that they reveal God to us, but in what they suggest.

Now according to this; since the revelation of which each apostle is the bearer, is limited to that apostle's experience of Jesus Christ, and partakes of that apostle's characteristic, it follows that the revelation must be imperfect. It is so identified with what is fallible and human, that it could not be taken as a perfect revelation.

This in a measure is conceded [*Prog. Orth.* p. 207]: —

It will be asked — “If the revelation partake of the characteristics of the man through whom it is given, must it not share his imperfection?” If by imperfection be meant such defect of character as is implied in the lack of ideal symmetry, we answer, Yes. The many years spent in Pharisaic bondage must have left an abiding influence upon St. Paul’s character; for grace cannot miraculously obliterate slow moral growths. We could not but expect that his bitter experience should have led him to find in the doctrine of justification a relative prominence which it would not wear to any who had not borne a chain like his.

But if this be a fair exposition of revelation by St. Paul, then it must follow that the doctrine of justification will appear in some measure as an exaggeration to all not having had his peculiar experience. Thus, the Word of God so far as revelation by St. Paul is concerned, is not a perfect rule of faith. But according to this view of inspiration the same may be said of the other apostles whose peculiar and differing characteristics have led them to similar exaggeration each in his own way. Thus by reviewing the sacred writers in detail, and marking the defects of the revelation by each, we must conclude that the Scriptures as a whole do not contain that Word of God which is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.

This conclusion appears to be recognized as likely to be drawn, and a remedy given, as in *Prog. Orth.* [p. 208]: —

In some rare cases one side of a truth is so *frankly* presented that only by finding a correlate elsewhere are we saved from misconception; as in James’s teaching concerning justification. But the slight blemishes in the very finest optical instruments do not prevent our obtaining from them data which to the human mind of finest training are exceedingly exact; and when we recollect that the imperfection of the organ of revelation is the correlate of qualities which give especial fitness to reveal God’s truth to man, we may dismiss the question of absolute perfection in the apostolic teaching as having no living interest.

But this remedy for the imperfections of the sacred writers is inadequate; first, because the correlate of James’s teaching concerning justification, wherever found, under this inspiration, is as liable to convey a misconception as the teaching of James himself: — secondly, because this remedy can apply, according to the illustration given, only to the human mind of finest training, while all others must be exposed to misconceptions of the Word of God contained in the Scriptures. To what proficiency in science, to

what description of fineness in training must one attain in order to be secure from misconception of the sacred writers! How imperfect the Scriptures as containing the rule of faith, if only a few of the finest training, may expect to receive the Scriptures without misconception of them!

Besides, who is to determine who these persons of finest training are? Those not of this elect number, would be incompetent to elect them, while it might not be safe to allow this number to be self-elective, lest the election be made by self-conceit.

Again, in denying that the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit exercised suggestive and directive power on the mind of the sacred penman, revelation is limited to the personal vitality, Christian experience, and characteristic of the writers; which makes it necessary that the revelation should be imperfect, because these writers had not attained to perfect holiness. Some sin still dwelt in the apostles. This sin must have given a tinge of error to their teaching, and to the revelation made by them. This objection is anticipated in *Prog. Orth.* [p. 207]:—

“Must not such sin as still dwelt in the apostles have tinged their religious conceptions and teaching with error?” We reply, This could not have been unless they were more under the influence of moral evil than we have any reason to suppose them to have been.

This answer to the question is not satisfactory; for first, it is not within the province of reason to determine that the sin which still dwelt in the apostles *would not* tinge their teaching with error. That would be rationalism. But secondly, if the question did come within the province of reason, the inference would be in the opposite direction, viz., that if sin did still dwell in the apostles, it *would* find expression in their religious conceptions and teaching: *unless* their conceptions and teaching were corrected by the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit from without, in superintending and suggesting the revelation to be made.

But *this* agency of the Holy Spirit is denied: hence there is no certainty that revelation coming from men in whom there is any sin could be a perfect rule of faith. This appears to be conceded in *Prog. Orth.* [p. 208], where it is said:—

We can hardly believe, indeed, that the truth as revealed through the apostles had such absolute purity as we must suppose it to have had if perfect beings had been the media of revelation.

This concession shows that such inspiration as is here held is inadequate. It could not insure a perfect and pure revelation, unless the media of revelation should be persons perfect in experience and characteristics, and sinless.

According to the view of inspiration implied in the Seminary Creed, in which the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit superintends and suggests to the sacred penman, the penman of himself might be imperfect, and sinful in some degree, and write a poor hand as compared with an ideal of perfect penmanship, and yet the revelation written by this penman would be legible and perfect as a rule of faith.

But inspiration as held in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, since it rejects this agency of the Holy Spirit, and cannot claim that it has perfect beings as the media of revelation, must be charged with presenting a revelation which is imperfect, and so not a perfect rule of faith, as revelation is declared to be in the Seminary Creed.

Again, inspiration as described in *Progressive Orthodoxy* is opposed to the Creed of the Seminary since it virtually assumes that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments do not compose the sum of revelation. Revelation may have been continued since the completion of the Canon of the Old and New Testaments. Accordingly, in *Prog. Orth.* [p. 209] we read:—

The views of Christ and of his truth contained in the apostolic Epistles must, from the nature of the case, always *shape* the religious and moral conceptions of the church. *Not that they alone possessed the spirit of wisdom and REVELATION. He is the spirit of wisdom and REVELATION in every soul in which He dwells*, and there have been some souls in ages since the apostolic into which he has so abundantly shed the radiance of God's truth, that they have been the spiritual luminaries of their own and following centuries.

According to this, Christ being not only the spirit of wisdom, but also of *revelation*, in *every soul* in which he dwells, it follows that revelation has been continued since the revelation recorded in the Old and New Testaments. It is added, indeed [*Prog. Orth.* p. 209], that:—

No Teacher in the Church has ever arisen or can ever arise so filled with the Spirit as not to depend upon the apostles for conceptions of God.

But it is also said on the same page [209] that “the apostles were continually drawing knowledge from the Old Testament

Scriptures," and again the prophets from whom the apostles drew knowledge were dependent upon the conceptions of God given to their predecessors. This dependence of the luminaries of revelation since the apostles upon the apostles; and of the apostles upon the prophets; and of the prophets upon their predecessors; is simply a dependence of *fellowship*. It is such that each in turn is the bearer of revelation in advance of that preceding, so that there is nothing in this to prevent luminaries of revelation since the apostles, from being the bearers of revelation in advance of that borne by the apostles. It is said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 211]:—

We would gladly cherish the thought that other teachers might arise, from whom should flow even more copious streams of living water than those which welled from the hearts of the apostles. But we are compelled to regard the circumstances of their lives as excluding such a hope.

We observe that the thought which would be gladly cherished, is that other teachers might arise *superior* to the apostles in the gift of revelation; and that there is nothing here maintained to preclude such an event, so far as the teachers in themselves are concerned. That which excludes the hope for such an event is the less favorable *conditions* and *circumstances* of all teachers subsequent to the apostles. But while teachers may not arise superior to the apostles in the gift of revelation, it is maintained that teachers will arise *having this gift*, though in less degree. This is further shown in *Prog. Orth.* [p. 212], which reads, —

The Church is ever adding to its knowledge of Christ, and the exegetical process is certainly not the exclusive means of making the increment. Out of mere study of books did not come its growing knowledge of Christ's relation to God, and to mankind, nor its conception of the breadth of his redeeming work. Such a product shows the revealing presence of the Spirit.

As further maintaining that the knowledge of Christ has not come to the Church exclusively by Exegesis we refer to *Prog. Orth.* [p. 12]:—

Single proof texts or collected proof texts are not a measure of Christianity nor of our knowledge of Christianity. The greatness of Christ is reflected in history as well as in Apostolic teaching; in the fulfillments of prophecy as well as in the comparatively indistinct letter of the original prediction; in the advance of the Church in an appropriation of the spirit of his teaching; in its growing power to think after Him his thoughts and to be inspired by his love; in the long succession of centuries which require new

interpretations of the meaning of his second coming; in the evolution of the economy of the Holy Spirit whom He sends, and whose work is conditioned by his *Person*, sacrifice, and reign. All these things put the Church now in a relation to his religion which never before has been paralleled.

Again, it is said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 10]:—

The Bible, it should be remembered, is not a collection of texts designed to establish propositions in systematic Theology.

In respect to what is said in these passages about texts of scripture; as already intimated in this paper, we say that without doubt, the Bible is a “collection of texts designed to establish propositions in systematic theology,” provided, the system of theology to be established is *biblical*. Single proof texts and collected proof texts are a measure both of Christianity and of our knowledge of Christianity, if the collection and classification of texts be impartial and exhaustive. As in mineralogy, by classifying minerals according to their refraction, density, cleavage, and angularity, with whatever other qualities they possess, various propositions are deduced and systematically stated; so by classifying texts of scripture, various doctrines are deduced and formally stated in their relations as composing systematic, *biblical*, theology. Of course, such a classification of texts will not serve in a systematic theology which aims only to be philosophical, and to move in the plane of human science, rejecting the supernatural. It is true also that doctrines have been formulated from the scriptures which were not true, because the classification of texts upon which they were based was defective. Arius and Sabellius both appealed to scripture. Neither of them took the position of the infidel. Each acknowledged the authority of the written word, and endeavored to support his position from it. But in these instances the individual mind picked up scriptural elements as they lay scattered upon the page and in the letter of scripture, and without combining them with others that lie just as plainly upon the very same pages, moulded them into a defective, and therefore erroneous statement. The test of a system of biblical theology; that which determines its soundness; is, whether the classification of texts of Scripture is complete from which the doctrines of the system have been deduced. This is because the word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only perfect rule of faith and practice, in all places and in all ages. So the system of biblical theology, of which it should be absolutely certain that its

doctrines were deduced from a perfect classification of texts of Scripture, would be a perfect system. The only rightful claim that a system of theology can have to being new, or of advance in thought beyond a preceding system, must depend upon its being able to show conclusively, that it has secured for itself a more perfect classification of proof texts from Scripture in support of itself than has been secured by any other system.

It is necessary to notice here, a mistake often made in which progress in the *application* of truth, is taken for progress in the truth itself. It is often said of science that it has made great advances in our time, as shown in mechanic art; when it is not pure science that has been the subject of progress, but that the progress made is only in the practical application of principles and laws in science which had been demonstrated and known as pure science for more than a thousand years. The same mistake has been made in proclaiming an advance in Christian truth as revelation, when in fact there was only new interest in the practical application of the good old revelation in itself infallible, and not subject to change or improvement.

Now, our complaint of the view of inspiration which we find in Progressive Orthodoxy is that it assumes progress in the *truth itself*, so that now the volume of Christian truth may be said to be greater than that contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; so that now those Scriptures as revelation do not contain the only perfect rule of faith and practice. This appears from the revelation of God claimed to have been made in other sources, the revelation in history; in every soul in which God dwells, and revelation in science, — such that the Bible has been obliged to wait for it, before it could have a definition.

[*Prog. Orth.* p. 15]: —

The question, What is the Bible? could not earlier be investigated as in recent days, for lack, apart from other reasons, of the requisite critical apparatus.

It is assumed that, any view of the Bible as of a perfect book, which brings it into collision with historical and physical science, weakens Christianity, by which it appears the word of Scripture and the rule of faith must be tried before the bar of science, and stand or fall according to whether they make good their claim before that bar. *Progressive Orthodoxy* is flavored throughout with this deference to science.

It is said [*Prog. Orth.* p. 110]:—

We believe that all the more obscure revelations of God, and all the religions as truly as the religion of the Hebrews, have been an education of the nations preparatory to the clear, glorious, and potent revelation of God in Christ.

The revelation, then, given by God in the history of the religion of the nations, is put on the same plane with the revelation in the history of the religion of the Hebrews given in the Scriptures, all preparing the way for the advent of Christ.

It is in this view, then, not the narrow revelation in the Scriptures, but this more complete revelation in the history of all nations, and the development of all science, that makes up the perfect rule of faith and practice.

Thus the whole tone and style of Progressive Orthodoxy goes to show that there is something besides the Scriptures, which must be taken in modification of the internal evidences and contents of the Scriptures in determining the rule of faith and practice. It is this rationalism, this domination of Science over the Scriptures, of which we complain, and which we believe to be in opposition to the Creed of the Seminary. We do not claim that reason has no vocation in relation to faith. We believe in the spiritual unity of the Bible; that the writings composing the Bible, though originating in widely distant ages and in so many different authorships, nevertheless when brought together, reveal a spiritual unity, constitute an organic whole, as truth to be received by faith; as truth *to* which reason and science have no capacity to make additions, and *from* which they have no capacity to make subtractions; either directly as by positive denial of any part of this truth, or indirectly by an unscriptural and rationalizing method of interpretation. Science may illustrate Divine truth, but science cannot produce new truth, as an improvement *upon*, or enlargement *of* Divine truth.

This supremacy of the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, by which it is the only perfect rule of faith and practice depends upon the *superintending* inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He served the sacred writers as a prompter. When a man goes on the stage he has a prompter behind him. If the man makes a mistake, the prompter corrects him. If the man makes a statement and the prompter does not correct him, the man knows he is right. It is because the Holy

Spirit, by the inspiration of Superintendency, so prompted the sacred writers that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are free from error, that the Word of God is contained in them; and that this Word of God is the only perfect rule of faith.

Now because we find in *Progressive Orthodoxy*, contrary to the Creed of the Seminary: that faith is said to be scientific; that we must call science to our aid before we can tell what the Bible is; that there are other sources of revelation besides the Scriptures; that the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit in superintending by inspiration the communications made by the sacred writers of the Scriptures is virtually denied;—therefore we maintain that Prof. Egbert C. Smyth in having composed the book *Progressive Orthodoxy* does hold, maintain, and inculcate, in opposition to the Creed of the Seminary, that faith ought to be scientific and rational, rather than Scriptural.

ARGUMENT OF REV. H. M. DEXTER, D.D.¹

To the Reverend and Honorable, the Board of Visitors of the Theological Seminary at Andover.

GENTLEMEN: It seems due to exact truth that I spend a preliminary moment in some further explanation, than has yet been made public, of the exact genesis of this procedure.

In the *Andover Review* for December last, [p. 579,] referring to a fear which has occasionally found expression of their untruth to their public pledges, after an intimation—in which we are not able to concur—that such a fear does not occasion “profound anxiety to the religious public generally,” Prof. Smyth and his associates went on to say:

We take the liberty of adding that we have become so familiar with the opinion of certain persons concerning our alleged inconsistency, that it is quite superfluous on their part to iterate and reiterate that opinion. Under the circumstances we feel warranted in referring our censors to Romans xiv. 4. [Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.]

We understood these Professors in this language to seek to repudiate that moral responsibility to the general judgment of the Christian community, from which they can no more withdraw themselves than they can elude the grasp of the atmosphere, or the force of gravity; and to intimate, that, though hundreds of the Alumni of Andover should be grieved and shocked at its apprehended defection, under their leading, from the evangelical truth which it was founded to advocate; it would be “quite superfluous on their part to iterate and reiterate that opinion.” And, we further understood them, for substance, to affirm that your Rever-

¹ The argument is here presented in full, several passages having been crowded out in the reading, by the pressure to close the hearing.

end and Honorable Board, by having said nothing and done nothing disfavoring their opinions and teaching, was distinctly permitting them to assume that it indorses their position, and was by "expressive silence" declaring that position to be agreeable to the true intent of the Founders, and (without perversion, or the smallest avoidance of their true design) identically the same with the views of those Founders themselves, without the least alteration, addition, or diminution.

Several of us met and consulted as to this. That consultation was repeated more than once, and enlarged by a wide correspondence. It ended in a conviction that the time had fully come when your Reverend and Honorable Board ought to be approached, and some inquiry made as to the warrant behind so startling a boast. A committee was therefore appointed to seek an interview for that purpose; and that committee — that it might not go as on a mere errand of idle curiosity — reduced carefully to writing some of the reasons why they, and those whom they represented, had been led into anxious solicitude as to the present condition of at least a portion of the Seminary teaching. We took the pains to have our statement privately printed for your convenience, and in order that what we had to submit, might, in its exact language, be contemporaneously placed in the hands of the Professors.

You, Gentlemen, very well remember, that, by your courtesy, we met you, in this building, on the evening of 6 July last, for the purpose named. It must further be in your memory, that the idea of making formal charges against anybody was then furthest from our thought; but that we were acting in what we supposed to be the spirit of a deliverance of your predecessors in office, of date Sept. 1844 [Dr. Woods's *History of the Andover Theol. Sem.* 425], in words, as follows:

Whenever the Visitors, from negligence, or from laxity in their theological views, shall be wanting in their duty, that guard to the purity of doctrines taught in this School, which the Donors intended to throw around it by perpetuating in this Board their own powers of supervision, will be broken down; and nothing will be wanting but similar defection on the part of the Trustees, to change this "fountain of living waters" into a "River of Death." If, in the progress of time, any officer of this Institution should adopt and teach opinions and doctrines inconsistent with those of the Donors, as clearly expressed in their declarations and creeds, it would be requiring of him the exercise of the principles of common honesty only, that he should resign. Self-respect, if no higher principle, it is to be presumed, would induce him to do it.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that this Institution will always be surrounded by friends jealous for its honor, and imbued with that love for the truth, and fortitude, which will lead them, even at the expense of personal ease, to sound the alarm, upon any appearance of danger.

We had no other purpose than thus to “sound” in your ears an “alarm,” in regard to what, to us, was an “appearance of danger;” supposing that our duty in the premises began and ended there. You recall the further fact, that—honorably scrupulous not to open your ears in his absence to any thing that might seem to be a *quasi* complaint against any Professor, you requested and directed us to reduce the substance of our paper to the shape of formal charges; and made it the duty of the respected Secretary of your Board—when that should have been done—to cite the Professors to make answer. Here, and thus, was the whole beginning of this case.

As to the intimation of the distinguished gentleman from New York, who opened the hearing upon the other side, that something was wanting to the moral make-up of this committee; as if our statement that we represented others than ourselves was a dishonorable pretence, I have only this to say; that I think it would open the eyes of the learned gentleman—and of our friends the Professors, as well—should we submit to their examination evidence in our possession of the number, quality and fervor of Alumni of Andover, who have been behind us, and who speak through us, on this occasion.

Gentlemen, bear with me in two or three further precursory suggestions. The iteration and reiteration on the part of those who seem to seek to serve their cause by an appeal to popular prejudice, have had weight with many to make them think that this is a trial for heresy—and therefore out of place in the nineteenth century, and necessarily a narrow-minded and odious thing. *You* very well know, Gentlemen Visitors, that this is not a trial for heresy; that it proposes no direct inquiry into the truth or falsehood of the opinions of the Respondent; but concerns itself solely with the question whether, having solemnly and repeatedly contracted to discharge the duties of the Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Andover in a minutely specified manner, he continues faithful to that contract. It is no more a trial for heresy than the inquest whether the professor in a Homeopathic hospital has been guilty, contrary to engagement, of Allopathic practice therein, would be a trial for heresy. To be sure the Re-

spondent has asked, "why, if this be not a trial for heresy, we did not prosecute the Treasurer of the Institution instead of prosecuting *him*?" To which I reply that we have never come to the knowledge of any reason to suspect the perfect uprightness of that, no doubt, most estimable officer. If he had established a Monthly Review for the purpose of advocating improvements in the multiplication table, or some new method of so subtracting as to leave the appearance of the former amount, and had made up by extracts therefrom, and published, a book called "Progressive Bookkeeping," we should think it might be well for *some one* to examine his accounts.

A good deal of fun has been made—and nobody in such a grim trial as this ought to object, even at his own expense, to a little fun flashed over its dark, but we hope not angry, face—of the expression used on our side that this was meant to be a "friendly suit." I need not remind you, Gentlemen, that this is a recognized use of terms to describe a case as to which both parties seek conclusive judgment, and therefore join in amicable submission of it to the proper authority. It certainly appeared to us to be eminently for the advantage of the Professors to obtain your official endorsement of their course, if they are right in it; and we should have been glad to have joined them, and borne our half of the trouble and expense of a legal inquiry which might have had that end—which it is to be presumed must have reached that end, should it prove the just one. Failing this, after your action upon our first request, no alternative was open to us but to go forward as we have done, or acknowledge that we had no imperative convictions upon the subject—which, as honest men, we could not do.

Another expression of ours has been severely censured. In seeking to make plain that we were not intending a trial for heresy, we have spoken of a "breach of trust." We never intended to charge, and we never did charge, any dishonesty of purpose—any conspiracy on the part of the Professors to steal a Theological Seminary. But we have felt, and, after all of explanation so far made, we still feel, that, in point of fact, there has been, on the part of the Respondent, such departure from teaching at Andover what its sainted Founders by their dead hands support him there to teach, as amounts to an actual breach of trust. But, if this at all, surely, in all its circumstances and consequences, it outsizes any thing else of the sort in the annals of a by no means unspotted century.

We have never questioned the eminent character as Christians and as Christian scholars, or the entire sincerity, of these gentlemen. We believe that they have believed themselves to be in the path of duty. They had a right to that opinion. We believed they were wrong, and we had a right to that opinion. It has seemed to us that others were as much — some even more — to be blamed, than these Professors; that something of the blame runs back into the spirit of the age — an age when public conscience has been weakened till there is a sort of common judgment that what under any color may be done lawfully, may be done rightly.

One more suggestion seems needful here — after many things which have been, almost bitterly, said — to make our position justly understood. We have never opposed, nor do we now oppose, progress under the Andover Creed. We believe in theological progress under that Creed quite as heartily as the Respondent and his associates can believe in it. In all respects, and to all extent, within the proper sweep and circle of the Evangelical faith, we rejoice in such progress; and have never intended to intimate, and never have intimated, that such progress is wrong. That is why we never found fault with Moses Stuart — *clarum et venerabile nomen* — or Dr. Park, or Dr. Phelps, or anybody else who was simply trying to file off the rust of an excessive Old Schoolism, and oil the joints of the machine, so that it could work without the squeak and friction of the dark ages lingering about it. They were doing what, under the Creed fairly interpreted by the recorded compromises and intent of the Founders, they had a perfect right to do. And if the Respondent had been doing nothing more than this, we would have admired and applauded his every just achievement. We do not object to the phrase “substance of doctrine,” within its proper limits. But there must be a limit somewhere, which shall bound this progress. And we understood the need of that limit stringently to assert itself somewhere between the positions of Prof. Park and the late Theodore Parker; and when it began to look as if that line ought to be drawn *behind* these progressing theologians, it became time for serious thought and examination. But I shall revert to this hereafter.

And, now, Gentlemen, I am to argue before you the eleventh charge of the list, to wit, that the Respondent holds and inculcates :

That there is, and will be, probation after death for all men who do not decisively reject Christ during the earthly life; and that this should be emphasized, made influential, and even central in systematic theology.

The Respondent has made answer by admitting that he holds and advocates the dogma of possible probation after death, but denies that he would have it emphasized and made central in systematic theology; and that it is inconsistent with the Creed of the Seminary. I do not regard the matter of emphasis as of importance, and so, without further reference to that, I join issue with him upon the main substance of the allegation, and I insist, and hope to prove, that, taken with its Statutes, the Seminary Creed is so phrased as to make it impossible for a believer in probation after death, honestly, not to say honorably, to hold the place of Professor under it; and therefore that the said Respondent does not, as to this, "maintain and inculcate the Christian faith as expressed in the Creed;" and, therefore, that he is liable to the third Article of the Associate Statutes, which declares that "no man shall be continued a Professor on said [Associate] Foundation, who shall not continue to approve himself a man of sound and Orthodox principles in Divinity *agreeably to the afore-said Creed*;" and that he is further liable to the clause of the twentieth Article of the said Associate Statutes, which makes it the duty of the Reverend and Honorable Visitors to "take care, that the duties of every Professor on this Foundation be intelligibly and faithfully discharged, and to admonish or remove him, either for misbehavior, *heterodoxy*, incapacity, or neglect of the duties of his office;" and to see that the "true intentions" of the Founders, "as expressed in these our Statutes, be faithfully executed."

I. *I ask your consideration, in the first place, to the proposition that, taken as a whole, the Andover Creed was so approached, so originated and so impregnated, and is so shaped and historically braced, and morally fortified in every direction from which such a notion could come; as to make it to the last degree improbable that the dogma of probation after this life can be fairly found in, or can be honestly harmonized with, it.* What had been the faith of the Christian world on that subject from the beginning? And what was it in New England in the summer of 1805, when, in consequence of the election of Henry Ware as Hollis Professor in Harvard College, Samuel Abbot altered the will by which two years before he had made that College his residuary legatee for the support of theological students; revoking that bequest and ordaining and directing that the money be given instead to the trustees of Phillips Academy [Woods, 59] "to be appropriated

to the support of a Theological Professor in said Academy, of sound, Orthodox, Calvinistic principles of divinity, and for the maintenance of students in divinity"? The quality of the soil with the environment, largely determines the nature of plant-growth. There are six thousand species of sea-weed, but you cannot find one of them in the interior of Africa, or on the top of Mount Washington. In what kind of theological soil—so far as Eschatology was concerned—did the Andover Creed germinate?

Some just answer may usefully be approached along two nearly parallel lines: by a rapid glance at the type of theological thought on the subject through the patristic writers down to the beginning of the 19th century; and by some succinct review of the (Ecumenical, denominational and Church Creeds to the same period.

1. *There can be no doubt as to the conviction of the great thinkers of the Early Church.* In the middle of the second century we find Justin Martyr using with the Emperor [*Apologia Prima*, c. xii.] the plea:

And more than all other men are we your helpers and allies in promoting peace, seeing that we hold this view, that it is alike impossible for the wicked, the covetous, the conspirator, and for the virtuous, to escape the notice of God, and that each man goes to everlasting punishment, or salvation, according to the value of his actions. For if all men knew this, no one would choose wickedness even for a little, knowing that he goes to the everlasting punishment of fire, but would by all means restrain himself, and adorn himself with virtue, that he might obtain the good gifts of God, and escape the punishments.

During the terrible pestilence which ravaged the most populous provinces of the Roman Empire a little after the middle of the third century, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, writing on the Mortality [*De Mortalitate*, xv.] said to the pagans around them:

The fact, that, without any difference between one and another, the righteous die as well as the unrighteous, is no reason for you to suppose that it is a common death for the good and evil alike. The righteous are called to their place of refreshing, the unrighteous are snatched away to punishment; safety is the more speedily given to the faithful, penalty to the unbelieving.

In the same century Hippolytus [*Omnium Hæresium Refutatio*, x. 30] refuting all heresies, as he draws toward his conclusion, exhorts all that inhabit Europe and Asia and Libya:

Do not devote your attention to the fallacies of artificial discourses, nor the vain promises of plagiarizing heretics, but to the venerable simplicity of unassuming truth; and by means of this knowledge you shall escape the approaching threat of the fire of judgment, and the rayless scenery of gloomy Tartarus, *where never shines a beam from the irradiating voice of the Word!*

Five-and-twenty years later we reach Arnobius, the gifted Numidian rhetorician, who [*Adversus Gentes*, II: 14, 53] as a relief for his mind propounded the theory of annihilation for those dying in sin:

They are cast in [to the river of fire], and, being annihilated, pass away vainly in everlasting destruction.

A century later Augustine [*Enchiridion*, cx.] announced it as a doctrine settled in theology:

It is *in this life* that all the merit or demerit is acquired, which can either relieve or aggravate a man's sufferings after this life. No one, then, need hope that, *after he is dead*, he shall obtain merit with God which he has neglected to secure here:

adding that "the services which the Church celebrates for the dead" are in harmony with this view. And in one of his *Letters to Evodius* [*Epistolæ*, clxiv. 13] he inquires concerning a proposed exegesis of the "spirits in prison" text:

If we admit this opinion, according to which we are warranted in supposing that men who did not believe while they were in life can in Hades [*apud inferos*] believe in Christ, who can bear the contradictions both of reason and faith which must follow?

It is surely of some significance that this greatest father of the Latin Church, of whom it has been, no doubt truly, said, that "no one mind ever made such an impression upon Christian thought," should have gone on to raise against the notion of the possibility of repentance after death the two following objections — having singular pertinence to the phase of discussion now present [*Ibid.*]:

In the first place, if this were true, we should seem to have no reason for mourning over those who have departed from the body without that grace, and it would be of no use to be anxious, and urgently to exhort men to accept it before they die, lest they should be punished with everlasting death. If, further, it be taught that in Hades [*apud inferos*] those only believe to no purpose [*inutiliter atque infructuose*] who refused here on earth to accept the preached gospel, but that to believe there will profit those who never despised that which they had it not in their power to hear in this world, another still greater absurdity follows [*aliud sequitur absurdius*] to wit, that forasmuch

as all men surely will die, and it is better for them to go into Hades wholly free from the guilt of having despised the gospel, — since otherwise it can do them no good to believe it when they come there — the gospel ought not to be preached on earth; which to think is as silly as it is impious [*quod sentire, impie vanitatis est*].

Origen alone of the patristic writers distinctly affirmed the possibility of reconciliation to God after death, saying [*Hom. in Levit. ix. 5*]:

A day of propitiation remains to us until the going down of the sun; that is, until the end of the world.

He, too, [*Joan. tom. xix. 3*] predated those ingenious modern expositors who interpret the declaration of the Saviour that the sin against the Holy Ghost [*Matt. xii. 32*] shall be forgiven “neither in this world nor in that which is to come,” as giving veiled announcement of the possibility of *post-mortem* forgiveness for other sins. There were also two or three writers in the 4th and 5th centuries who thought some form of restoration not impossible.

The early conceptions of the Intermediate State — under the suggestions of Origen, the suppositions of Augustine, and the definite declarations of Gregory the Great, slid readily into the Romish doctrine of Purgatory; a doctrine which — as I need not remind *you* — taken with its connections, distinctly repudiates all idea of probation after this life — Purgatory being for the imperfectly righteous, and not at all for the wicked. And when Protestantism, centuries after, began to frame its ideas into propositions, it spoke strongly and squarely, and almost uniformly, to the point that salvation lies this side the grave; continuing so to speak until the recent speculations of Kahnis, Oosterzee, Dörner, Martensen, and others, whose influence, I take it, has assembled us here to-day.

The view which prevailed among godly men in England when this country was settled, is very well shown in that once greatly thought of, but now seldom seen, *Treatise of Christian Religion*, which was published in complete form in 1616, under the supervision of the executors of the renowned Thomas Cartwright. It [72] speaks thus:

Q. Hitherto of the punishments [of sin] in this life: What are they in the life to come?

A. They are most horrible and vnspeakable: first, the soules of the wicked, after this life, are sent immediately to hell, vntill the day of Iudgement: then at the day of Iudgement, their Bodies shall bee ioyned to their Soules, and both

together shall be tormented in hell fire euerlastingly; and so much the more tormented there, by how much they haue had more freedome from paine of body, and anguish of soule, and losse of outward things in this life.

Such having been upon this subject the direction of Christian thought and faith as revealed by the great scholars of the Church through eighteen centuries, I ask you next to examine :

2. *The testimony of the Creeds.* On 7 October last, at Des Moines, the Respondent declared before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, that neither the Gospel nor the *consensus* of Christendom, condemns the doctrine of probation after death. Speaking [*Great Debate*, 17] of the denial of the wisdom of sending out as missionaries those who are not prepared to declare that mens' only chance for salvation is in this life, he used these words :

I say in all calmness, but with a conviction that has been deepened and matured by all the experiences of these trying times, that [denial] is putting into the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, what the Gospel itself does not contain, and what the Creeds of Christendom have not put there. You may go through all the Œcumenical Creeds — and I know them almost by heart — and there is nothing of the sort in them. I have been through the Creeds of our local Churches, many and many of them, and the doctrine is not there.

Gentlemen, I am not a professor of Ecclesiastical History, and I do not know those venerable Symbols by heart — I therefore desire to speak with becoming modesty ; but I heard this declaration, when it was made, with an amazement which was deepened when I came home to my own library again. As this is not a trial for heresy, the question whether probation after this life be a part of the Gospel, is aside from our immediate discussion ; but the question what has been the attitude towards it of the Creeds of Christendom is germane to our inquiry, and assumes a very serious importance as we approach the interpretation of the Andover Creed. Of course we cannot forget, that, as an element of denial and antagonism lies very near to the heart of any Creed, it is never safe to infer that such a Symbol is hospitable to every notion which it may not in terms denounce. Dr. Schaff, in his great work on *The Creeds of Christendom* [i. 8] says :

The *first* object of Creeds was to distinguish the Church from the world, from Jews and Heathen; afterwards orthodoxy from heresy; and, finally, denomination from denomination.

Almost always a new Creed has been framed as a polemic protest against some dogma thought to need rejection. So that if the fact were that absolute and unhinting silence reigned in the Creed-world as to the dogma in question, that would more prove its non-existence, than its presence with general acquiescence.

Now let us take a look at the great Denominational Creeds of Christendom, — five-and-twenty to five-and-thirty, in all — which the Respondent says have nothing against probation after death in them. They fall into four classes : (1) the ancient Catholic Creeds ; (2) those of the Romish Church from Trent to the Vatican ; (3) those of the Eastern or Greek Church ; and (4) those of the modern Protestant churches. Those of the first class include but the few fundamental ideas which are common to all periods and churches ; of which that called the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian are chief. The latter contains a single statement [clauses 40, 41, 42] which, I respectfully submit, in its connection, seems most naturally to teach that the things done in the body are those in view of which men are to be finally assized, viz. :

From whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead ; at whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies ; and shall give account for their own works ; and they that have done good, shall go into life everlasting : and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

The perfectly balanced parallelism obvious here between the two classes, added to the known opinions of the time, seems to warrant construing this against the dogma.

Passing into the second class, it is obvious that the general drift of "The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent" is toward the doctrine that salvation is possible only to him who *in this life* is reconciled to the Church ; and it is explained [14th Session, chap. vii.] that all priests may absolve all penitents *in articulo mortis*, "*lest any may perish*" for lack of such absolution.

The Eastern Church is more explicit. Its "Orthodox Confession" [*Questio* LXIV.] cites Theophylact commenting on Luke, and Matthew, in proof that penitence in the future world is not possible ; with which agrees the 372d Question and Answer of "The Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church," thus :

"372. *In what state are the souls of the dead till the general resurrection?* *Ans.* The souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a fore-

taste of eternal happiness; but the souls of the wicked are *in a state the reverse of this*—which can hardly be a state of continued probationary privilege.

Passing on into the Creeds of the Modern Protestant Churches, I pause a moment with an utterance of the Vaudois, of date A.D. 1126 [J. Leger, *Hist. Gén. des Églis. Vaud.* etc. 85] which sums itself up into the marginal note [*nul remède après la mort*] “there is no remedy after death for a life of impenitence.”

The *Second Helvetic* [A.D. 1566] was chief of the Swiss Confessions—at once most elaborate, and most catholic—and found warm approval among nearly all the Reformed Churches on the Continent, as well as in England and Scotland. It [chap. xxvi. 3] has this deliverance:

We believe that the faithful, after bodily death, do go directly unto Christ, and, therefore, do not stand in need of helps or prayers for the dead, or any other such duty of them that are alive. In like manner, we believe that the unbelievers are cast headlong into hell, from whence there is no return opened to the wicked by any offices of those who live.

Another of the great Reformed Confessions is the *Belgic*, written by Guy de Bres at about the same date with that to which I have just referred, for the Churches of Flanders and the Low Countries; and revised, in 1619, by the Synod of Dort. From that revision I cite [Art. XXXVII. (2)]:

Then the books (that is to say the consciences) shall be opened, and the dead judged according to what they shall have done in this world, whether it be good or evil.

The *Heidelberg Catechism*, [A.D. 1563] the ripe doctrinal fruit of the Reformation in the Palatinate, speaks on the subject before us mainly by implication. But in its answer to the 44th question,—of the descent into Hades—and to the 52d,—of Christ’s coming again to judge the quick and the dead—it uses language which the commentators of its own Church firmly consider as authoritative on this subject. In regard to the former, Dr. Bethune [*Lectures on the Heid. Cat.* i. 404] is led to comment thus:

All well-taught Christians believe that, though the disembodied soul of the wicked man goes to the hell of fire, and the soul of the pious man goes to heaven, at once, the one will receive a great accession of misery, the other of bliss, when souls are united again to their proper bodies; because then the *entire man* will suffer or enjoy with greater intensity.

And in 1652, Petrus de Witt published a *Catechizing upon the Heidelberg Catechisme*, which, after inspection, received the approbation of the Classis of Hoorn, and, after sixteen editions, was translated for the use of the English Reformed Congregation in Amsterdam, in 1654. The Tercentenary Committee [*Hist. Introd. to Heid. Cat.* (1863), 67] say that this *Catechizing* was “republished a great many times, and had an immense reputation.” It is safe, then, to infer that it rightly gives the inner sense of the Symbol, on the topic in dispute, as it was understood at the time. Under *Question LVII. [Sub-question 25, Do not the souls of unbelievers presently go to Hell ?]* it says :

Ans. There is a Hell into which they go presently after their death, [John iii. 36; Isa. lvii. 21, lxvi. 24]. Which Christ [Mark ix. 44, 48] expressly explaineth of Hell and eternal condemnation. . . . But the uttermost and highest degree of Damnation shall be after judgement, in Soul and Body together [2 Cor. v. 10].

Of very nearly the same date was the *Confession Belevit and Professit be the Protestantis of Scotland*, and confirmed by General Assembly and by Parliament; in which we find this statement—I translate from the Latin of Patrick Adamson [Art. XVII.] :

The elect who are dead enjoy rest from their labors, peace and tranquillity. . . . But, on the other hand, reprobates and unbelievers who are dead live in troubles and tortures which it is impossible for words to express.

Even more clearly spake the *Irish Articles of Religion* [of date A.D. 1615] [Section 101,] thus :

101. After this life is ended the souls of God’s children be presently received into Heaven, there to enjoy unspeakable comforts; the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, there to endure endless torments.

In 1644 was published the first Confession of Faith of the English Baptists, which was printed again in 1646. Its 52d Article [*Confession*, p. 23] was thus :

LII. There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, and every one shall give an account of himselfe to God, that every one may receive *the things done in his body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

Moreover the Baptist *Catechism*, which Mr. E. B. Underhill [Hansard Knolly’s Soc.’s Pubs. *Confessions*, etc., p. xv.] declares

to "give a complete idea of the prevailing doctrinal sentiments of the Baptist body in the 17th century," has this, viz. :

Q. 42. *What shall be done to the wicked at their death?*

A. The souls of the wicked shall, *at their death*, be cast into the torments of hell, and their bodies lie in their graves, till the resurrection and judgment of the Great Day.

We have in order of time now reached that Symbol, which, from its relation to the religious history of our Father land, scarcely less than for its formative influence over the Andover Creed, has most value for our research—the *Westminster Confession*, of date A.D. 1647. It contains, in remarkably clear and emphatic language, two utterances on this subject, from distinct points of view. [C. xxxii. 1; C. xxxiii. 1] :

The Bodies of men, after death, return to dust, and see corruption; but their Souls (which neither die nor sleep) having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The Souls of the Righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their Bodies. And the Souls of the wicked are cast into Hell, where they remain in torments and utter darknesse, reserved to the Judgment of the great Day. Beside these two places for Souls separated from their Bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none. . . .

. God hath appointed a Day wherein he will judge the World in righteousness by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father. In which Day not only the apostate Angels shall be judged, but likewise all persons, that have lived upon Earth, shall appear before the Tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their Thoughts, Words and Deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the Body, whether good or evil.

In the following year the Synod of Cambridge, N.E., adopted this Westminster Symbol — thus anticipating by ten years the similar action of the English Independents. In 1680 the Synod of Boston readopted the same. In 1708 the Synod of Saybrook, Conn., again endorsed it. The Boston National Council of 1865 in its session on the Burial Hill of Plymouth pathetically said :

[*Debates and Proceedings of Nat. Council*, 361 : —]

Standing by the rock where the Pilgrims set foot upon these shores, upon the spot where they worshipped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, Elders and Messengers of the Congregational Churches of the United States, in National Council assembled — like them acknowledging no *Rule* of faith but the Word of God — do now declare our adherence to

the Faith and Order of the Apostolic and Primitive Churches held by our Fathers, and *substantially* as embodied in the Confessions and Platforms which our Synods of 1648 and 1680 set forth, or reaffirmed.

And when, at Oberlin, O., in 1871 [*Minutes of Nat. Council*, (1871,) 63] the National Triennial Council was established, our denominational faith was still declared to be :

In substantial accordance with the great doctrines of the Christian faith, commonly called Evangelical, held in our Churches from the early times, and sufficiently set forth by former General Councils.

Granting to this qualifying word “substantially” all breadth and force which history can legitimately put into it, or ethics fairly allow in it, there must still remain the clear conclusion that the Westminster is, more nearly than any thing else, our actual Congregational Creed to-day.

The Westminster Catechisms — *Larger* and *Shorter*, followed the *Confession* from the Assembly’s hands, so that everywhere they must gain their true interpretation from it. The *Larger* says, in the last clause of its answer to the Question [ed. 1723, p. 80] :

Q. *What is the communion in glory with Christ which the members of the Invisible Church enjoy immediately after death?*

Ans. [l. c.] Whereas the souls of the wicked are at Death cast into Hell, where they remain in Torments and utter Darkness, and their Bodies kept in their Graves, as in their Prisons, till the Resurrection and Judgment of the Great Day.

It has been thought remarkable by some who have never made themselves minutely familiar with the facts — and I ask your attention to this, as having close connection with what I shall have occasion to submit to your Honors’ notice by and by — that while, in answering the 37th question, the *Shorter Catechism* declares that at death the souls of believers “do immediately pass into glory” it says nothing at all about what, at death, becomes of the souls of the wicked. Robert Baillie — that garrulous and convenient Scotchman whose *Letters and Journals* shed such an electric light upon many previously dark passages in the work of the Westminster Divines, — says under the date of 23 Aug. 1648 [iii : 59] :

We passed both the *Larger* and *Shorter*, as a part of uniformitie; but we thought the *Shorter* too long, and too high for our common people and children, and so put it in Mr. David Dickson’s hand, to draw it shorter and

clearer. Of this he was carefull, and presented us with a draught before the end of the Assemblie, which truly was very good and exact; but yet so high and long, that it was recommitted to Mr. John Levingstone.

Which Geo. Gillespie confirmed in his speech at Edinburgh, 6 Aug. 1647 [*Ibid.*, p. 452], when he said :

We have found great difficulty how to make it [the Catechism] full, such as might be expected from an Assembly, and, upon the other part, how to condescend to the capacity of the common and unlearned.

The exact truth with regard to this feature of the Shorter Catechism, then, seems to be, that in the repeated recensions to which it was subjected in the endeavor to reduce its inordinate original length, the Assembly retained the first part of the Answer to the 37th question, affirming that the souls of believers “do immediately pass into glory,” because it was needed as a protest against Purgatory, but expunged the second — and balancing — portion — given both in the Confession and the Larger Catechism — apparently because nobody was then known to deny that the wicked went at once to their award, so that the assertion being practically needless, could be spared; the more that more circuitously, yet by easy inference, the same conclusion follows from other declarations of the same Symbol.

It is a rule of interpretation which is as common as it is proper, that an abridgment is always to be interpreted by the full work from which it is condensed — saving only when it is of subsequent date, and is avowed to contain, in some points, emendation. That this could not be the case here becomes evident from the consideration that the Shorter Catechism [Mitchell’s *Westminster Assembly*, etc. 426–431; Baillie’s *Letters and Journals*, ii. 232, 242, 248, 266, 272, 306, 336, 348, 379, 388, 403, etc.] was under discussion at the same time with the Confession and the Larger Catechism, and embodied the cotemporaneous judgment of the same Divines. It is therefore fairly to be construed everywhere, and always, into the closest doctrinal unity with its coetaneous documents.

In 1658 a Synod of some two hundred Elders and Messengers from one hundred and twenty English Congregational [Independent] Churches which had met in the Savoy, unanimously adopted the Westminster Confession — with slight verbal changes, none of which touched this subject — as their Declaration of Faith. [*Savoy Declaration*, 51, 52.]

In 1677, the English Baptists added to their former Confession, the doing of the same thing, retaining however the upright and downright averment that *the deeds done in the body* determine the conditions of man's future existence. [*Confession of Faith*, etc. Schaff, iii. 738.]

In 1729 the American Presbyterian Church adopted the same Confession, afterwards adding both the Larger and Shorter Catechisms to their Standards; all of which remain in force over their from seven to eight thousand congregations, and I may add their Theological Seminaries, to-day.

In 1742 American Baptist Churches in session in Philadelphia, adopted the Westminster Confession as adapted to Baptist use by their English brethren, leaving unaltered its doctrinal character.

In 1813 the Cumberland Presbyterians did the same thing, with slight changes, leaving it as to this, unchanged.

In 1834 the Free Will Baptists — as they then called themselves — adopted a Confession — since three times revised. As it now stands its language on this subject [*Schaff*, iii. 756] is :

The soul does not die with the body; but immediately after death enters into a conscious state of happiness or misery, according to the moral character *here possessed*.

Gentlemen, the Respondent at Des Moines declared of the doctrine that, by God's plan, salvation needs to be secured in this life, that "there is nothing of the sort" in "the Creeds of Christendom." I have shown you, in most cases by direct citation, in a few instances by close and necessary inference, that he was mistaken in regard to *nineteen* of them — the Athanasian; the Romish; the Greek; the Vaudois; the Heidelberg; the Second Helvetic; the Belgic; the Scotch; the Irish; the first of the English Baptists'; the Westminster Confession, with its Catechisms; the Cambridge; the Savoy; the final English Baptists'; the Saybrook; the American Presbyterians'; the American Baptists'; the Cumberland Presbyterians', and the Free-Will Baptists'; most of a national or even a wider scope; none including fewer than the suffrages of an entire community or denomination of Christians — among them being those whose influence most went to shape the early years of this country; and all together representing on this subject the judgment and faith of an immeasurable majority of the Christian world.

To this may be added in the same direction, in a slightly differ-

ent form, the Creedal testimony of the Established Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. The Thirty-nine Articles, adopted by the former in 1562, and by the latter in 1801, do not indeed contain direct reference to the Intermediate State. But the XXXVth Article as it stands to this day in the Standards of both Churches affirms that the Second Book of the Homilies “doth conteyne a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessarie for these tymes.” Now we find in the Third Part of the Homily of Repentance in that book [*Homilies*, (ed. 1676,) 340] the following :

But as we are most certain that we shall die, so are we most uncertain when we shall die. For our life doth lie in the hand of God, who will take it away when it pleaseth Him. And verily when the highest Sumner [summoner] of all, which is death, shall come, he will not be said nay, but we must forthwith be packing, to be present before the Judgment seat of God, as he doth find us, according as it is written ; Whereas the Tree falleth, whether it be toward the South, or toward the North, there it shall lie. Whereunto agreeth the saying of the holy Martyr of God Saint Cyprian, saying: As God doth find thee when he doth call, so doth he judg thee.

The Respondent further said at Des Moines [*Great Debate*, 17] — a fact to which I have already called your attention — that he had “been through the Creeds of our local churches, many and many of them, and the doctrine [of the denial of probation after death] is not there.” Now, Gentlemen, for the purpose in hand we care nothing about the aspect towards this subject of the Creeds now in use in our local churches, although we should not shrink from the closest examination as to them. But it is of some consequence to know what was the attitude of the Congregational churches of Massachusetts toward this matter in the first decade of the present century, when the Andover Creed was formulated ; because it is not very likely that the parties, were they Hopkinsians or Old Calvinists, who were concerned in shaping this Creed and founding this Institution, slipped quietly into that most exactly and painfully phrased Declaration of Faith a doctrine on this, or any other subject, which was at variance with the Symbolic Orthodoxy of the time, as it found expression in the formulæ which were the corner-stones of their churches. I have therefore sought to examine the Creeds of *fifty* of those churches which, in 1808, were nearest to the locality where the Seminary was planted — churches *of the vicinage*, as one might say, in the phrase now current — all, or nearly all — selecting none and neglecting none — being within

some twenty miles of Andover. I have reached the following result. I will not take time to specify in detail, but, if called for, I will declare each in full, and where the proof may be laid hold of.

I find seven of the fifty Creeds to have been modernized since the date referred to, while I have not been able to put my hand upon that form of sound words which was in use by those seven churches so long ago. I find no single instance of the employment of any language which suggests, or which seems intended to leave any opportunity for the esoteric holding of the notion of, probation after this life. I find five which are vague in their terms which touch on the borders of that subject,—a good example of which is that of the First Church in Danvers, which had been founded in 1689, being “then persuaded in matters of faith according to the Confession of Faith owned and consented unto by the Elders and Messengers of the Churches assembled at Boston in New England,” which that Church had modified, in the interest of brevity and perspicuity, in 1757, by the adoption of twelve articles of Faith, the 11th and 12th of which are these, [Rice’s *Hist. 1st Par. Danvers*, 77] viz. :

You believe in another life after this, and that Christ will come again, and raise the dead and judge the world, and that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, [and] that at the last day the wicked shall be adjudged to everlasting punishment, and the righteous to life eternal.

Here is no definite statement which necessarily excludes the possibility of repentance and forgiveness after death, yet surely there is nothing in the language to favor—as there is nothing in the circumstances to suggest—it. As I said, there are five of these. I find four which make the general statement that the impenitent man shall receive a “reward according to his works,” or “deeds.” I find one which declares that “all who remain in unbelief till death, will be immediately doomed to the world of misery;” one which affirms that “such as live and die unbelieving, impenitent and disobedient, shall suffer the vengeance of eternal fire;” and one which sets forth that “the souls of the wicked enter immediately into a state of suffering, and the righteous of blessedness.” I find twelve which assert that the wicked shall be judged “according to the deeds done in the body.” And I find nineteen which refer the inquirer to the “Confession of Faith, owned and consented unto, by the Elders and Messengers of the Churches

assembled at Boston in New England, 12 May 1680," on this subject identical in terms with that of Savoy and Westminster; which we have already seen to carry a double denunciation of any notion of probation after death, in maintaining that men shall be judged for "what they have done in the body," and that the souls of the wicked after death "are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the Judgment of the great Day."

Here, then, we have the pregnant fact that of *forty-three* Congregational churches — all which I have been able to test as to this subject — surrounding the spot where the Andover Seminary came into being, at the hour when its Creed was taking shape, not one in its own Creed in any manner favored the dogma of *post-mortem* probation; only nine refrained from some statement which would be necessarily incompatible with it, and thirty-four — or more than seventy-nine *per cent* — in terms asserted its opposite. And yet my honored friend says he has gone through the Creeds of our local churches, and there is nothing there against the doctrine of probation after death!

Now, Gentlemen of this Reverend and Honorable Board, we have been trying to get some conception of the theological quality of the soil out of which sprang the Andover Creed, with particular reference to the question whether there may exist any fair antecedent probability that that Creed would take any particular shape of friendship, or hostility — of assent, denial, or an indifference which might silently tolerate — toward the notion of probation after this life. And we have found this, namely, that, almost with the sole exception of the Neo-Platonic Origen, whose intense conception of free-will on man's side, and of the reformatory rather than the punitive intent of the Divine punishments of sin, led him to teach the possible final restoration of all offenders — including the Devil, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodore of Mopsuestia and one or two others who achieved from the Church of the fifth century the odium of heresy as to this, down to the beginning of the present century; the consent of Church writers to the belief that the things done in the body determine men's eternal condition, has been well-nigh unbroken. We have found that quite to the present time, those "Creeds of Christendom" which enshrine the faith of the immense majority of the professedly Christian-world, whether Protestant or otherwise, declare the same belief. And we have found that, of nearly fifty Congregational churches which surrounded

Andover Hill when the foundations of the Seminary were planted thereon, not one favored departure from the old theology as to this, only nine failed to use language irreconcilable with it, while nearly eighty per cent in terms asserted its opposite.

But I am at this point reminded that our distinguished friend the Professor of Law from New York City, argued before us that a meliorating movement, springing from John Robinson and his influence, even made some mildness at Westminster, quite melted down the early Congregationalism of New England, and eventually left a soft spot at Andover. I fear that the research of the learned gentleman has neglected the nice points of Dogmatic History for more congenial jurisprudence. At any rate he is woefully mistaken in this judgment. The simple fact is that no man ever had more baseless nonsense talked about him than John Robinson. A good, a gracious, a gentle, a noble, a learned and tenderly devout man, with great sagacity as to civil affairs, and with some strong out-goings towards very precious new ideas; he was yet, in his theology, wholly and inveterately, a man of his own age. The Synod of Dort was scarcely more than well through with its work, when half of his company started for our side of the sea. Of that Synod Motley says [*John of Barneveld* ii. 310], and I judge that he speaks the exact truth:

Arminians were pronounced heretics, schismatics, teachers of false doctrines. . . . On the 30th April and 1st May the Netherland Confession, and the Heidelberg Catechism, were declared to be infallible — no change was to be possible in either formulary.

Now John Robinson, at the time when the Pilgrims were starting for Plymouth, appears to have been occupying his leisure hours in writing a book cordially to defend that infallibility. I hold the book — printed in 1624 — in my hand, and I will read from it two or three brief extracts, in order that we may see just how mild and liberal in theology John Robinson was. The book is titled *A Defence of the Doctrine propounded by the Synode at Dort: against John Murton and his Associates*, etc. Who, Sir, was John Murton? John Murton was one of the exceedingly few Englishmen of that day who were "liberal" in theology, and was the leader of an Arminian secession from one of the Churches of the English exiles at Amsterdam. So that in the very act of attacking him, and his company, Robinson ranged himself on the side of the old theology against the new. But hear what he says:

If they say, further, that wicked men may and shall be saved if they repent, they say but as the truth is: but if thereupon they conclude of all simply, that therefore they may either repent, or be saved, they erre, etc. [p. 30.]

And let me here turn into the very bowels of these mens errour, the sword of the Spirit which the Apostle, in this place, puts into mine hand; and proue briefly, but evidently, that Christ dyed not for all and every person, as is said; but onely for them, and for all them who in the end are saved, and obtain eternall life by him. . . . The Apostle's meaning [Rom. v: 9, 17 etc.] therefore is not, that Christ died for all particulars [i.e.: all persons as particular persons], but that all for whom he dyed, shall be saved by him: which seeing all are not; it followeth that he dyed not for all, as they mean. [pp. 60, 61.]

So, in critically explaining the text [1 Tim. ii: 6] "Christ gave himself a ransom for all," Robinson says:

By "all" is not meant all particulars [everybody] in the world, but all sorts of people, as well kings (which many Christians, considering their cruell hatred of Christ, and other enormities, thought rather to be prayed against, then for) as others. The Apostle here informs them better, and that Christ dyed for *all*, and would haue *all*, that is, *men of all sorts*, saved — even kings as well as others. It is not possible for any Christian to pray for every particular person in the world: nor lawfull to pray that God would saue all in generall: seeing we know by the Scriptures, that all shall not be saved, and are also forbidden to pray for some in particular. [p. 62.]

Infants, therefore, bring sin properly into the world with them. [p. 139.]

It would be easy, Gentlemen, to quote scores of passages from this and from other works of this distinguished and beloved man which should demonstrate — were further demonstration needed — that he lived and died as far from all liberalism in religion, as the East is from the West.

But, we are asked, did not John Robinson utter those famous words which declared him: "very confident the Lord had more truth and light yet to breake forth out of his holy Word?" And did he not exhort the company he was sending away with his blessing: "if God should reveal any thing to them by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever they were to receive any truth by his Ministry" — and so on? Most assuredly he did. But we cannot rightly understand his words, until we consider what he meant by this language, and in reference to what subject, in his judgment, new light might fairly be expected.

What he had in mind in speaking to his people, and what they had in mind in listening to him, was not doctrinal truth. They

had found, or supposed they had found, their final rest as to that, in Calvinism. What he was talking about was *Church government*. The major part of the Christian world was well at rest, and for a long time had been well at rest, in regard to theology; while, as to polity, then for almost half a century that portion which they mainly knew had been in a turmoil suggestive of a raging sea that cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. Calvin's Presbyterianism; Thomas Cartwright's Presbyterianism; the Presbyterianism of Walter Travers and John Udal; Robert Browne's practical Democracy; Henry Barrowe's Presbyterian Congregationalism; Francis Johnson's High Church Barrowism; Henry Ainsworth's Low Church Barrowism; Robinson's own Broad Church Barrowism — all these in conflict with the Papacy on the one side, and the Reformed and English Churches on the other, had perplexed and wearied them. And, as the Christian world had not long been studying *that* subject, the Leyden pastor did hope that some new light might any day flash forth from some long neglected text, until in its mellow illumination all these doubting and divided brethren should see eye to eye.

But how did so wide and long a misapprehension arise? Easily, and thus. The record was first made by Edward Winslow in his *Hypocrisie Vnmasked*, in 1646 — more than a quarter of a century after the event. The book was an argument in defence against the slanderous accusation of the notorious Samuel Gorton, that the Leyden church had been rigid and bitter Separatists. Winslow denied this. Of his own knowledge he affirmed Robinson's liberality. He referred in proof of it to that Divine's *Apology*. He insisted that the church, in fact, had always held communion with the Reformed Churches. And then he passed to this "Farewell Address." To refer what he said of it to theology, would be to empty it of all relevance to its place and purpose. To interpret it as referring to polity, makes it an effective link in its chain of reasoning. Moreover he exalts as the glorious consummation which would follow the outbreaking of the desired light, not any new phase of doctrinal concord, but [p. 94]: "How easie would the differences be reconciled between the Presbyterian and Independent way!" He afforded another proof that polity and not doctrine was meant, by the further remark set down from Mr. Robinson's lips [p. 98]: "For, said hee, there will bee no difference between the unconformable [Nonconformist] Ministers and you, when they come to the practise of the Ordi-

nances out of the Kingdome ;” and Winslow in the close of the same paragraph intimates that his purpose in what has been said is to help “about the settling of *Church-government* in the Kingdom of England.” The excessive scarcity of Winslow’s book — of which fewer than a dozen copies are known to exist, and which has never been made accessible to the public by any full reprint — has favored that popular misapprehension which was not unnaturally set on foot, when, five-and-seventy years ago, our Unitarian friends undertook, from the imperfect account given in the pages of Neal, to make the Pilgrim pastor their apostle and oracle.

The learned Professor further traced this Robinsonian “mildness” down through the Westminster Assembly, where he told us one party urged “that no fixed and immutable Creed could properly be made,” to New England where — if we understood him — he judged it to have shown itself in the quality of early missionary instruction to the Indians. I have brought with me the means of exposing these misapprehensions also ; by making it clear from the fertile pages of *Baillie* [ii. 110, 307, 336] that — with the exception of some few words on Chiliasm and the like — the debates which agitated the Assembly concerned Pastors, doctors, Elders, and subjects of the detail of Church government, and were not about doctrine ; and, from Eliot’s *The Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-rising of the Gospell with the Indians in New-England* (1647), that the Evangelical message which was here relied upon to save the savage soul was still of the old-fashioned sort. But I must not take time to read more than a single extract describing the Indian Apostle’s second endeavor to preach the gospel to *Waubun*, and his company [p. 16] :

We set forth the terrour of God against sinners, and mercy of God to the penitent, and to such as sought to know Jesus Christ, and that sinners should bee after death *Chechainuppan*, i.e., tormented alive — for wee know no other word in the tongue to expresse extreame torture by.

I may conclude, then, this part of my argument with the expression of the profound conviction that the more men really know about John Robinson’s books, labors, and character, the more profound will be their respect for him, and the less their temptation to exalt him as the father of modern liberalism, or to reason from him to any assumed lenity in any Creed of our day, or of his own.

3. *There is another source of valuable testimony as to whether the founders of the Seminary were antecedently likely to agree upon any creed tolerant of probation after death; and that is the judgment on that subject of those Theologians whose influence was then dominant, and whose friends and disciples were foremost in the work.*

Jonathan Edwards had been dead just fifty years when the Seminary was founded, but it was a kind of death which was yet speaking. That intense moral earnestness which exalted his lumbering style to eloquence; that sweetness of Christian spirit, which, as apple-blossoms perfume the rugged tree on whose boughs they blush, made welcome even for his merciless logic to appreciative souls; and that awe-inspiring conviction of duty to a sovereign God which dominated his system and himself; together made him — though gone up on high — a more influential citizen of New England than perhaps any single man who was eating and sleeping in it still. Hours might be spent in reading from his pages passages — some, like that whole sermon on *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God*, of lurid and fairly terrific power — which show that wherever his mind carried conviction nobody doubted that men's eternal state is determined by the things done in this life. Near the close of the first volume of his Works is given a short treatise of one-and-thirty pages "Concerning the Endless Punishment of those who die Impenitent" [*Works* i. 612-642]. It is largely devoted to a reply to the objections of Mr. Whiston, in which President Edwards is led to discuss the unscripturalness and unreasonableness of probation — or of reformation — after death, from several different points of view. What his feeling and opinion on the question were, one or two extracts will indicate [*Works* i. 621]:

15 *Sect. Matt. v: 25, 26.* "Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt not come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." These words imply, that sinners are in the way with their adversary, having opportunity to be reconciled to him but for a short season, inasmuch as it is intimated, that they must agree with him quickly, or they shall cease to be in the way with him, or to have opportunity to obtain his favor any more. But, if they shall be continued in a state of probation after death to the end of the world, and after that for (as it were) endless ages; how far, how very far, are these words of Christ from representing the matter as it is!

And so again [*Works* i. 616] he says :

If any of the separate souls of the wicked, that are in the case that the soul of the rich man was in, when he died and lift up his eyes in hell being in torments, should repent and be delivered before the day of judgment, and so should appear at the right hand among the righteous at that day, then how could that be verified, 2 *Cor.* v: 10, "For we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, whether good or bad"? And we have reason to think that the time of standing before the judgment-seat of Christ, which the apostle has a special respect to, is the day of judgment, if we compare this with other Scriptures; as that of the same apostle, *Acts* xvii: 31. "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." And many other places.

The younger Edwards had been dead only between six and seven years when the Creed was shaped at Andover. For his own sake, as well as for his illustrious father's sake, he had been very dear to the New England churches. He had been the theological instructor of two of the most eminent of the men who had to do with the early days of Andover, Dr. Dwight, and Dr. Griffin. And this is the view he took of probation after death. [*Works* ii. 444] :

How can the idea . . . consist with the various declarations of the Scripture that those who die in sin are "lost," "perishing," suffer "perdition," are "cast away," "are burnt up," etc.? . . . They are no more lost, than while they are under the discipline of providence, in this world. Nay, they are with respect to their true interest in no worse situation than they are in this world, but in a vastly better, as they will be under means of grace vastly more conducive to their highest happiness and salvation, than what they enjoy here.

Dr. Joseph Bellamy had been dead eighteen years. He had been a Theological Seminary in himself, and in those days of private and pastoral instruction is judged — with a single exception — to have trained more ministers than any other New England Divine. He began his famous *True Religion Delineated* with these three sentences. [*Works* i. 7] :

We are designed by God our Maker, for an endless existence. In this present life we just enter upon being, and are in a state introductory to a never-ending duration in another world, where we are to be forever unspeakably happy or miserable, according to our present conduct. This, is designed for a state of probation, and that for a state of rewards and punishments.

Dr. Nathanael Emmons was then in the five-and-thirtieth year of his mighty ministry at Franklin — where, going beyond Dr. Bellamy, he had himself theologically educated as many as one hundred young men. The first intent in regard to the new seminary which afterward was planned to be at Newburyport, was that it should be built up under his eye, and care, at Franklin. He was perpetually consulted as to all the details of the institution as they were gradually developed; and it is stated in his Memoir [*Works* i. 208] that before “its carefully written Creed was adopted, every word of it was placed, again and again, before his keen eye.”

Now, in his Sermon on *The Death of Sinners not pleasing to God*, Dr. Emmons [*Works* vi. 299] tersely said:

Eternal death is peculiar to the finally impenitent. . . . As soon as they leave this world, they will go into a state of everlasting separation and alienation from God, where he will pour out the vials of his wrath upon them, without mixture and without end.

Dr. John Smalley was in the fiftieth year of his pastorate at New Britain, Conn., and was recognized as a distinguished specimen of “the sober, staid, reasoning, and conservative class of Divines” [*Sprague*, i. 565] yet we find such passages as these in his published discourses [*Sermons*, p. 72]: “repent in this only space for repentance;” [*Ibid.*, p. 415]: “all sinners must repent . . . in this space of repentance, or their sins will never be blotted out.”

Dr. Moses Hemmenway, who had been at Harvard a classmate and intimate of the elder President Adams, — a man of distinguished ability and great learning — and who was in his forty-ninth year of service at Wells, Me., in a Sermon on *Means of Grace to be attended before Faith*, [*Seven Sermons*, 161] thus declared his views:

Sinners are on probation for eternal life, under a constitution of grace. . . . A reprieve is granted to them, that they may be treated with, and called to repentance, upon the foundation of a Covenant of grace. It is true, while they are unbelievers and impenitent, the condemning sentence of the law stands in force against them; and will be executed upon all who are not when they die united to Christ, and so interested in the saving benefits He has purchased, according to the new and gracious covenant.

Dr. Joseph Lathrop was in the fifty-second year of his labors at Springfield, Mass. He was reputed to hold a middle ground

between the Arminians and the High Calvinists, so that he could not be suspected of being over-rigid in his tenets; yet thus he spake [*Sermons* i. 150, 152] on the point before us:

The grace of the Redeemer brought him down from heaven to die for guilty mortals. He has suffered, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. He now offers them his salvation with affectionate tenderness, and urges their acceptance of it with an importunity that would take no denial. But when the day of their probation shall expire, the overtures of his love will cease. . . . In the present world, many prayers are made, and many means are used, for the recovery of sinners; and blessings are often granted them in consequence of the fervent petitions, and kind offices of their pious friends. But in the future world, they will enjoy such advantages no more.

Take — by way of contrast — a *young* man, who had graduated at Middlebury only two years before, Rev. Caleb Burge, and we find him before long printing a treatise on the Atonement, which elicited remarkable commendations from the ablest thinkers of the time, to which he added an Appendix of fifteen or twenty pages mainly devoted to the proof that spiritual reformation after death is most unreasonable, and which he thus concludes [*Essay on the Atonement* (ed. 1859), p. 545]:

And now, reader, let me tell you that Jesus Christ is your Saviour; but if you do not believe in Him, and make application to Him for pardon, you must die in your sins, and perish forever.

Edward Payson was within nineteen years of the end of his remarkable career at Portland when the Seminary was founded, and, on this subject, we find him — the gentle, the saintly, the practical — in a discourse on “The End of Time” [*Works* ii. 593] faithfully saying:

The moment in which we leave this temporary and mutable state, we shall enter a state which is eternal, and, of course, unchangeable. Sound philosophy unites with Revelation in declaring that no essential change can take place in eternity. The moment in which we leave the body and enter the future world, eternity will set its stamp upon us, exclaiming, “Such as I find you, you shall continue to be while I endure.” “He that is righteous let him be righteous still, and he that is sinful, let him be sinful still.”

But our survey of those elements which should fairly first be considered in putting its true sense upon the Andover Creed as a whole, would be far from complete did we omit the judgment of that great man, the grass upon whose grave by the side of his

meeting-house in Newport had hardly yet had time to get green and thick, Dr. Samuel Hopkins; whose attitude acquires some special determinative force from the two considerations: that one of the coalescing parties whose long-delayed harmony at last constructed and consented to the Creed, was called by his name; and that it was commonly reported fifty years ago, or more, that William Bartlet, the largest donor among the Founders, had given to all the judgments of this Divine in theology that very solid proof of concurrence and commendation which was involved in publishing the Doctor's (somewhat ponderous) *System of Divinity*, at his own expense.

In that System, thus published, we find the following dense argument. [*Works* ii. 38, 39, 44]:

The only time of probation allotted to man is that of this life, to which the death of the body puts an end; so that every one will be happy or miserable in the future, endless state, according to his character, which is formed before the soul is separated from the body. This is plain and certain from the Scripture, where there is not a word, or the least hint, of another state of trial, after the death of the body, but much is there said to the contrary of this. This life is represented as the sowing, or seed time, and that men shall reap in a future state according to what they do in this life. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting" [Gal. vi: 7, 8]. This life is represented as the only time to lay up a treasure in heaven, — to make to ourselves friends, so as to be received into everlasting habitations, when we fail here, when this life ends; — to make our peace with God, which Christ represents and urges, by agreeing with our adversary while we are in the way with him, otherwise we shall be cast into prison, from whence there is no deliverance. And he represents Lazarus and the rich man as *fixed*, — the former in a state of happiness, and the latter in a state of misery — *immediately upon their going out of this world*. And it is said, "It is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment" [Heb. ix: 27]. And if nothing were said, relating to this point, but the following words, it is fixed in them beyond a doubt: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive *the things done in his body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" [2 Cor. v: 10]. If, at the final judgment, when the endless state of men will be fixed, they shall be judged according to what they have done in the body, then this life is the only time of probation, and in the body they fix their character and state for eternity. . . . Death is justly terrible, and a dreadful evil, to those who are in their sins. It deprives them of all good; it puts an end to their probation state, and to all hope, and fixes them in a state of sin, despair, and endless misery. This is necessarily implied in the words just cited: "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law." Death could have no sting, by sin or

the law, more than any other change or event in life, if it did not fix the curse of the law upon the sinner, when he dies, and put an end to his probation and hope. The sting of death is the evil which sin deserves, and which the law denounces, which is the second death. The death of the body fixes this sting in the sinner's heart, which is endless destruction. . . .

The spirits of those who die in their sins pass into a state of darkness, despair and tormenting wickedness; and all hope, comfort and enjoyment being taken from them, they must be totally lost, and overwhelmed in misery; yet looking forward to a resurrection and judgment to come with aversion and dread, as involving a great increase of their sufferings, which can have no end. These are the *spirits in prison*, of which the Apostle Peter speaks, who are reserved to the general judgment, when each one shall receive according to what he has done in the body.

With their great teachers uniformly teaching thus, can the supposition be reasonably entertained for a moment, that in an institution founded to perpetuate that teaching, a doctrine in flat and fatal opposition to the same could receive legitimate endorsement?

4. *Such being the probabilities as to the shape which the Andover Creed would take in regard to the dogma of probation after death, growing out of the tone of the Church in all time previous, as expressed by its profound thinkers, and in its great Creeds, and suggested by the temper and teaching of those chief Congregationalists of the time whose influence was saturating the Churches of New England like an atmosphere; still more important testimony in the same direction may be gained from the consideration of the recorded faith and historic purposes of the individuals who gave their money, prayers, time, strength, and enthusiasm to establish the Institution, and of those who were first made Teachers in it, and Visitors over it.*

There was, on the one side, the Phillips Academy, which had been founded at Andover in 1778 by the Hons. Samuel and John Phillips, with paramount purpose to make it train Christian men, and, if possible, ministers; which—with the help of the excellent, if not eminent village pastor, Rev. Jonathan French, who was an old-fashioned Calvinist as distinguished from the then new-fashioned Hopkinsians—had already trained a good many; and around which, the election of Henry Ware as Hollis professor at Harvard, had the effect to centre the thought and interest of Samuel Abbot, and Eliphalet Pearson, and a second John Phillips, and Mark Newman, and Samuel Farrar, and Jedidiah Morse; all increasingly persuaded that *the* thing which the cause of Christ required more than all else in New England then, was, that upon the germ and nucleus of that Academy, already controllingly

Christian in its intent, should be built up a Theological Seminary. Now, what evidence have we as to the way in which these gentlemen were likely to stand affected toward the idea of probation after death?

We have first the very extraordinary and significant fact that after the funeral of the chief original founder, the Hon. Lieut.-Gov. Samuel Phillips, the trustees of the Academy — being together at his late residence — were informed [see *Records Gov. Phil.'s Donations*] that, by will:

For the preservation of the essential and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel as professed by our pious ancestors, the first settlers of New England, and to guard against the dissemination of the least particle of infidelity or modern philosophy, and also against the dispersion of such theological treatises, or speculations, as tend to undermine the fundamental principles of the gospel plan of salvation,

they are asked to accept from him a legacy, in trust, to be appropriated to the circulation, in the Institution and in the vicinage, to preserve Orthodoxy, if possible, “in all future time,” of certain volumes: — first the Bible, next the Westminster Assembly’s Shorter Catechism. Now, we pretty well know what the deceased Lieut.-Governor thought of the bearing of those two books upon the question before us. What next? Dr. Watts. Let me refresh your recollection how Dr. Watts stood on this subject. Take his 2d Hymn, 2d Book [*Works*, iv. 200]:

My thoughts on awful subjects roll,
 Damnation and the dead;
 What horrors seize the guilty soul
 Upon a dying bed.

Ling’ring about these mortal shores
 She makes a long delay,
 Till, like a flood with rapid force,
 Death sweeps the wretch away.

Then swift and dreadful she descends
 Down to the fiery coast,
 Amongst abominable fiends
 Herself a frightful ghost.

There endless crowds of sinners lie,
 And darkness makes their chains;
 Tortur’d with keen despair they cry,
 Yet wait for fiercer pains.

Not all their anguish and their blood
 For their old guilt atones,
 Nor the compassion of a God
 Shall hearken to their groans.

And that such was not his professional Psalm-Book style alone, this, from his miscellaneous muse [*"The Atheist's Mistake," Works*, iv. 345] bears witness :

The gasp of your expiring breath
 Consigns your souls to chains —
 By the last agonies of death
 Sent down to fiercer pains.

Chief among other volumes with which this good man desired to impregnate this school within and without in its earliest years, to the end that it should stay impregnated "in all future time," was Dr. Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*. Let me remind you how that volume insists that death closes probation [*Works* i. 300] — as thus :

When surviving friends are tenderly mourning over the breathless corpse, and taking a fond farewell of it before it is laid to consume away in the dark and silent grave, into what hands, O sinner, will thy soul be fallen! What scenes will open upon thy separate spirit, even before thy deserted flesh be cold, or thy sightless eyes are closed? It shall then know, what it is to return to God to be rejected by him, as having rejected his gospel and his Son, and despised the only treaty of reconciliation; and that such a one, so amazingly condescending and gracious. Thou shalt know what it is to be disowned by Christ, whom that hast refused to entertain; and what it is, as the certain and immediate consequence of that to be left in the hands of the malignant spirits of hell. There will be no more friendship then: None to comfort, none to alleviate thy agony and distress: But, on the contrary, all around thee labouring to aggravate and increase them. Thou shalt pass away the intermediate years of the separate state, in dreadful expectation, and bitter outcries of horror and remorse. And then thou shalt hear the trumpet of the arch-angel, in whatever cavern of that gloomy world thou art lodged. . . . Thou must come forth and be reunited to a body, now formed forever to endure agonies, which in this mortal state would have dissolved it in a moment. . . . There shall *I* hear thy cries among the rest, rending the very heavens in vain.

The recorded fact that the trustees "cheerfully accepted" this, which they, at the same time, called "a sacred and important trust," is evidence enough that on the side of the house which they represented, there was no retrocession from the Westminster doctrines in Eschatology, and no desire to shrink from their plain-

est and fullest utterance — a fact which it is useless to take time to prove by special citations from the writings of individual men ; but which the files of the *Panoplist*, which [*Life of J. Morse*, p. 71] from 1805 to 1808 was under the sole control, as editor and publisher, of Dr. Morse, both through his own articles and those of contributors, abundantly demonstrate.

Turning from the Old Calvinists to the Hopkinsian side of the house, it hardly needs — after the full expression which I have given to Dr. Hopkins's own views, that much be said in exposition of theirs. I will refer only to Dr. Samuel Spring, who was in his thirty-first year at Newburyport, and who was the leading mind among the company — including prominently besides himself, William Bartlet, who had paid the expense of publishing Dr. Hopkins's *System*, Moses Brown, John Norris, and Leonard Woods first Abbot professor, — which, early in 1807, undertook to establish in Newburyport that Hopkinsian Theological School, which, as the result of well-nigh interminable diplomacy, was at last brought to Andover, and united with that there inchoate, to make by a compromise the Institution which through a kind of pious fungous growth became attached to the original foundation of Phillips Academy.

* In an Ordination Sermon [*Sermon at Ord. of Mr. Bell*, p. 27] Dr. Spring said :

Thus the good man and the bad, make the journey of life upon diametrically opposed principles. At times they seem to travel in company and mutually aim at the same end. They live together in the same family. They walk together hand in hand to the same house of worship. They are often members of the same visible Church. But while *death* raises one to the mansions of endless love and increasing delight, *it sinks the other into the furnace of God's unending and increasing wrath.*

Dr. Samuel Worcester — one of the closest friends of the Institution, who took Dr. Spring's place as a Visitor in 1819, had then recently published a small volume [*Six Sermons on the Doctrine of Future Punishment*] in which [p. 70] he says :

The door of mercy is shut against individual sinners when they die. For, as it was formerly shown, those who die in their sins are reserved in prison unto the day of judgment to be punished.

Dr. Woods was the first Abbot professor of Theology. And this is the manner in which he afterward expressed the views of

his life in reply to John Foster's ingenious and tender-hearted speculations [*Works*, iii. 287]:

If it were the design of a merciful God to turn all the wicked from their wicked ways and to make them heirs of his kingdom at some future time, it would be natural for us to think that he would inform us of so important and so pleasing an event. But he has given us no such information. We look in vain for any proof that God will bring sinners to repentance and carry on the work of sanctification in the world of perdition, or that there will be any dispensation of grace after the present life, which is the accepted time, the day of salvation. In all the accounts we have of the wicked in the future state, not a single instance of repentance is mentioned, and not a single intimation that any such instance will ever take place. On the contrary, we are clearly taught, that the state of the wicked after death, and the judgment day, will be unchangeably fixed.

Dr. Edward Dorr Griffin was the first Bartlet professor of Sacred Rhetoric. Those who have read his famous "Park St. Lectures," know what his views were—often presented with appalling eloquence. But I find the following in a discourse of his "On the Uncertainty of Human Life" [*Sermons*, p. 8]:

By the spirits of our departed friends, by the joys of those that sleep in Jesus, and the pains of those who have no God, I adjure you to consider that when you have once plunged into eternity, there is no coming back to make a second trial. If you have rushed into the presence of God with sins unlamented and guilt unpurged, all is gone, eternally gone, without recovery or redress.

Dr. Eliphalet Pearson was the first Professor of Sacred Literature. In his *Public Lecture on the Death of Pres. Willard of Harvard College* [pp. 17, 18] he said:

Of all beings in our world man alone is capable of religion, or of knowing, obeying, loving and forever enjoying his Creator. He is also destined to exist in two different states; the first a state of probation; the second of retribution. The former momentary; the latter eternal. That man is thus formed, and thus destined, every person in a Christian land must acknowledge, whose conscience is not seared, as with a hot iron. What madness must it then be, to delay preparation for eternity! . . . It must never be forgotten that this eternal weight of glory depends upon the moral character established in the present state.

It surely looks very much as if *all* who—whether as founders, or framers—had any thing to do with the *primordia rerum* here, were of one way of thinking as to this—and that the old-fashioned way.

In a matter of so great moment we can hardly be too careful however to look well to our evidence — and so I introduce another most important witness here, Dr. Timothy Dwight, then President of Yale College, and who was one of the Visitors originally selected, and, in 1808, by statute associated with Dr. Samuel Spring and the Honorable George Bliss, and Messrs. Abbot, Bartlet, and Brown of the Founders, as the Controlling Board of the Institution. He preached the sermon, on Wednesday, 28 September, 1808, when the Seminary was formally established, its Professors inaugurated, and the new School of Theology declared to be open for the admission of students. He had been in correspondence with the Founders from the very first, and he is known to have possessed their confidence in a marked degree. It is perfectly safe, therefore, to take him as interpreting them upon the question before us.

The CLXIII^d Sermon of his *Theology; Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons*, etc. [ed. 1819, v: 407-424], is upon “Death,” and one head of that Discourse [p. 415] is as follows, *viz.*:

IV. *Death terminates the Probation of Man.*

That Death ends our Probation, so far as this world is concerned, I shall not be expected to prove. That there is no Probation beyond the grave, is evident from the fact, that such a state is never mentioned in the Scriptures. Every thing, which is said in them concerning futurity, exhibits it only as a state of reward.¹ To this object they conduct us; and then close their communications.

But this is not all, nor even the chief proof of the Doctrine. In Eccl. ix: 10, we are informed, that *there is no work, device, knowledge, nor wisdom, in the world of departed spirits whither we go.*² The work, here mentioned, is plainly the work of salvation; and this, it is declared, cannot be done. Hence *Solomon* exhorts us to *do* this work *with our might*, while we are in the present world.

In Acts iii: 21, *St. Peter* says concerning Christ, *Whom the Heaven must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things.* But Christ, we are elsewhere informed, will come a second time to Judgment. At this time then all things will be restored, which will ever be restored. The present *Heavens and Earth will then pass away*, and be succeeded by *new Heavens and a new Earth*, in which *righteousness will dwell* forever. But we are

¹ It will be remembered by those who are familiar with Dr. Dwight's writings that he often — as here, and again in a passage to be quoted further on — uses this word as applying to evil consequences as truly as to good ones, as did the old writers, *e.g.*, Spenser [*Faerie Queene*, iii. c. 12]:

Yet not escaped from the due reward
Of his bad deedes.

² These italics are all Dr. Dwight's own.

abundantly assured, that, at this period, the everlasting rewards of the righteous and the wicked will commence. There will, therefore, be no future Probation.

In John ix: 4, our Saviour says, *The night cometh, in which no man can work*: that is, the season, of which Death is the beginning, and Eternity the continuance. All the probationary work of man, therefore, is ended when Death arrives; and will never be resumed.

That Dr. Dwight rightly apprehended, and in no manner shrunk from, the legitimate consequences of the doctrine thus held, becomes obvious from his application of the subject, *e.g.*, [*Ibid.*, p. 421]:

As this life is the only time of probation to man; the present is the only period, in which this mighty evil [of eternal death] can be prevented. Seize, therefore, this golden season; and, while it lasts, *Work out your salvation with fear and trembling*. Think what it will be to die forever. Remember how short life is; how uncertain; by how frail a tenure possessed; and how apt to vanish before we are aware. Feel, that in this short period, if ever, your salvation is to be secured.

So, in the sermon following, on *The Immediate Consequences of Death* [*Ibid.*, pp. 431, 432], Dr. Dwight says:

The Soul, after Death, returns immediately to God, to give an account of its conduct in the present life. This appears to be the plain language of the text [Eccl. xii: 7], in which the return of the body to the dust, and of the soul to God, are exhibited as coexisting events. . . . Its secret chambers and all which they contain, or have ever contained, will be laid open to its own eye, as well as to that of its Maker. In this manner, the motives by which it has been governed, and the moral character which it has sustained, during its probation, will be so entirely developed, as to satisfy even itself, that the investigation has been just, as well as complete.

And then, in the application of this discourse [*Ibid.*, pp. 439, 440], he adds:

We know that we must die: we know that death will terminate our probation: and are assured that it will introduce us to the Judgment. Wisdom therefore demands, common sense demands, that we should make effectual preparation for death, by preparing ourselves for the Judgment. . . . Let me solemnly ask this assembly, Are you prepared for this awful event? Is your account ready?

Here, now, we have an original Visitor, chosen by and associated with the Founders themselves, and one with whom we have reason to know they were especially well pleased, contemporaneously declaring in the most distinct, solemn, and emphatic manner

his belief : (1) that probation ends with this life ; (2) that there can be no probation beyond this life ; (3) that *immediately* at death *all* souls return to God, to give their account, and receive the reward of the good or bad use which they have made of their probation here. Is it conceivable that, in this, he did not fairly represent the Founders' views — views unalterably identified with the Seminary, and from which no departure can lawfully be made by any Professor?

I may spend a moment here to put in — although out of place in point of time — the fit testimony of another distinguished member of the same family ; — a family somewhat largely represented on the other side in this hearing ; the witness of one of a singularly serene and beautiful presence, a strong and noble and dignified man, who more than most men won general respect for the sagacity of his intuitions and the soundness of his judgments ; who was a Visitor of this Seminary from 1856 to 1865 ; I refer to Dr. William T. Dwight, late of Portland, Me. In a *Discourse on Spiritualism*, of date 1857, [p. 10] he said :

While we inhabit the body and are thus filling up probation in preparing ourselves — each for his own unchangeable state hereafter, God has determined that we should possess just so much knowledge of the World of Spirits as can be acquired from His own announcements by inspired prophets and apostles and the Saviour ; and he has also determined that we should possess no other knowledge. The fact that He has revealed to us in the Bible what we thus actually know respecting the invisible world and its inhabitants, is in itself decisive evidence that He purposed we should know nothing additional.

Gentlemen : What I have been trying to do, and what I take leave humbly to think that I have done, is to prove to you that the Andover Creed as a whole — and without reference to any of its clauses in especial, is such an instrument — so related to the Christian centuries that went before it, and so impregnated with their profoundest and most solemn judgments ; so related to the religious quality of its own time in New England ; so related to the faith and intent of the godly men, who, with immense caution, and intense and minute scrutiny, laboriously, and by a wearying succession of mutual verbal concessions, shaped it for a great purpose, sacred to them, until they fondly hoped that it might be, letter by letter as it was, durable by the side of the precious things of the lasting hills ; that it is asking too much even of human credulity to believe that the notion of probation after death, which

I shall by and by prove was definitely abhorred and rejected by them, can be harmonized with it.

No, Gentlemen! When one informs me that Neal Dow has been carried home helpless from the gutter; that Robert Ingersoll is delivering free lectures in support of the evidences of Christianity; that Phillips Brooks has exchanged pulpits with Dr. Herrick — each presiding over the Eucharistic service for the other; that the Massachusetts Baptists, in annual Convention assembled, have invited the Pedobaptist world to sit down with them at the Lord's table, and have prefaced that ordinance by the sprinkling of infants; when one tells me such things, I am ready to examine the evidence on which the assertion is made, before declaring a negative conclusion. But when one tells me that a labored instrument drawn up with scientific precision to contain the Orthodoxy of the past as concentrated in the Westminster Symbols, and to conserve the same, unaltered and unalterable, for the most distant future — in the intent that through all time it shall be training men to be persuading other men to repent because now is the accepted time and now is the day of salvation, and there will be no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither they are hastening — is on the whole advanced, advantaged and extremely well pleased to have its preachers moderate their message to the mild remark [*And. Rev.*, Aug. 1885, p. 147]: "There is much reason to believe that this present life is the most favorable opportunity for moral renewal in Christ," I have no need to look at the evidence. The assertion itself is evidence. I can decide at once.

II. *Such being the Creed, as a whole, in the respect which I have considered, I now call your attention to the fact that it was distinctly understood at the time when it was adopted and the Seminary went into operation under it, that, such as it was it must forever remain; that it could never be altered or amended in the smallest particular, and that any Professor who — outside of the reasonable limits of its own self-consistence — might change his mind concerning, and cease in all respects to believe and teach, it, as a man of honor and of Christian principle, was expected to resign his office, or must be removed by the Board of Visitors.*

The intent of the Founders as to this, was as clearly and distinctly expressed, as the best lawyers of the day were able to frame it. The 27th of the Associate Statutes, adopted 21 March 1808, is as follows:

It is strictly and solemnly enjoined, and left in sacred charge, that *every article of the above-said Creed* shall forever remain *entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, addition, or diminution.*

While the 12th Article of the same Statutes thus begins :

That the trust aforesaid may be always executed *agreeably to the true intent* of this our Foundation and that we may effectually guard the same *in all future time* against *all perversion*, or the *smallest avoidance of our true design*, as herein expressed, we the aforesaid Founders, do hereby constitute a Board of Visitors, to be as in our place and stead the Guardians, Overseers and Protectors of this our Foundation.

Gentlemen, I respectfully submit that it was an absolute impossibility for the Venerable Founders — in whose place and stead you sit here to-day that you may effectually guard, oversee and protect the magnificent charity which they endowed — it was an absolute impossibility in any speech of man for them to convey to you, and to convey to the Professors, and to convey to the world, their purpose, wish, injunction and solemn command, that the Creed on which they had at last heartily agreed, should never be altered by so much as the dotting of an i, or the crossing of a t, and that you should exercise the lawful power they gave you to make sure that it shall never be thus altered, if it be not conveyed in the citations I have read from their Statutes with regard to it. It is precisely as Gov. Strong wrote [*Woods*, 519] to Dr. Spring, 27 Oct. 1807 : “ *The original Statutes of the Founders appear to me to be as great a security against erroneous principles as language can afford.* ”

All this will be confirmed if we glance at the ebb and flow of the process by which the union between the two projected schools at Andover and at Newburyport, at last, after almost interminable delays, heart-sickening to both parties, had been effected. The correspondence published two years ago in the Appendix of Dr. Woods’s *History* sheds great light on this. Every thing turned upon exactness in phrasing the doctrines in the form agreed on, and then in applying the same fairly and honorably in all the details of procedure, and especially in the choice of Professors. Dr. Woods wrote to Dr. Spring, early in 1807 [*Appendix*, 487] that the Andover Old Calvinists felt that :

The great objection is, the apprehended danger of the union. It is feared that Orthodoxy [that is to say Old Orthodoxy] would be borne down, and that a counter influence [that is to say, Hopkinsianism] would prevail.

Moses Brown [*App.* 492] wanted "no mention made of Hopkinsianism, but wanted Old Calvinism up to the hub." From the beginning, one narrator says [*App.* 508], there was "a *constant* interchange of bright and cloudy days." Each party was afraid of the other. In the Fall of 1807 Dr. Pearson and Dr. Spring prepared about a dozen articles [*App.* 512] "containing principles and conditions of coalition;" and then Dr. Spring thought they ought to have as many more. They had [*App.* 515] to move "prudently and gradually," first on account of the scruples of one man, and then on account of those of another. Now [pp. 508, 515, 545] it was Mr. Norris; now [p. 500] it was Mr. Bartlet; now [pp. 475, 523] Dr. Spring; now [p. 107] Mr. Abbot. All this went on for eight months, or more. Dr. Pearson plied his old horse and chaise from Andover to Newburyport and back *thirty-six times* [*Memorial of 50th Anniv. at Andover*, p. 119] in carrying on these negotiations. More than *six weeks* [*Woods*, p. 103] were spent in shaping the Creed—with its three sentences, its 36 doctrines and its 1061 words—during which the chief minds of both parties were "together as much as was consistent with other duties," so that they had no occasion for correspondence. It was tentatively completed [*Woods*, 102] 15 June 1807, but it was not polished and harmonized to entire agreement among them until 1 December following. Nor even then did it have rest.

One of the two men who chiefly prepared it, has given this account of the labor [*Woods*, p. 101]:

It was the special and declared object of Dr. Spring and myself, to whom was committed this solemn work, that it should be such as would satisfy the Orthodox community; and particularly such as would secure for our School the support and coöperation of the great body of Congregational and Presbyterian ministers and Churches. [Fancy their putting in the seeds of probation after death, in such circumstances!] We were well aware that, in order to do this, the Creed must contain the doctrines of our Puritan ancestors, which were the doctrines of strict Calvinism. If it fell short of this, it would be deemed defective. If it went beyond this, it would excite dissatisfaction. The character of our Orthodox community made it perfectly clear that the standard of doctrine in our Theological Academy must be *thoroughly Calvinistic*; nothing short of it, nothing incompatible with it. Such was the well-known view of Dr. Spring, and even of Dr. Emmons.

After all this patient and adroit thoroughness new troubles arose. Mr. Norris [*Woods*, *App.* p. 574] wouldn't subscribe unless "some minute alterations were made;" and [p. 571] Dr. Spring had to "resort to prayers and tears" before he did sign. Then

Mr. Bartlet stood in the way as to one point [*Ibid.* 577] and he was "a man of peculiar independence, whom the world cannot move out of his own way." Mr. Brown also bolted. These two were finally pacified [*Ibid.* 578], and gained over, by the pledge that their statutes should be "*unalterably fixed.*" They would withdraw and go on by themselves, unless they could have their way in this. Six months before the day of the public exercises by which the Institution in its completed form was thrown open to the public [*Woods*, 579], Dr. Spring wrote to Dr. Morse :

I never saw Mr. Bartlet so much afraid of the union as he is this moment, and they told me decidedly and unitedly to inform Dr. Morse that *there must be no alterations.* For they are fixed, and cannot consistently yield any further. . . . Mr. Bartlet was bold in the expression that he had rather double the donation, and go on as at first intended, than to be perplexed any further. *They will not submit to any alteration.*

Add to this the fact that the President of the Board of Trustees, himself a Professor-elect, and one of the two principally concerned in framing the Creed and the Statutes, in a *Historic Sketch* [p. 7] soon published *by order of the Trustees*, declared it to be the object of the Institution to set forth and adhere to :

The great system of revealed truth contained in the Bible, avowed by the Reformers, embraced by our Forefathers, and *expressed in the Assembly's Catechism . . . as must be evident from the Creed which they* [its Professors] *are required to subscribe.*

Gentlemen, I cannot but regard as full of deep significance this fact, that *six months after* that adoption of the Associate Creed which we are told has forever removed the Shorter Catechism from all right of supremacy, as a Symbol, over the belief of the Professors on the Associate Foundation ; and as a part of the solemnities of opening the Seminary ; it was thus publicly and officially declared that the views of the Fathers as "*expressed in the Assembly's Catechism*" were those to be adhered to and set forth ; and that the Board of Trustees then in office — who might be supposed to have exact understanding of the facts — gave to the same their utmost indorsement.

I call attention here to another point which I believe has escaped the attention of previous speakers ; and that is that two things remain to be reasonably accounted for by our friends who insist that, once in, a Professor may rightly stay in, so long as *he thinks* he is in all good conscience before God and man, able by

some ingenuity of explanation, or elasticity of conscience, to imagine that he is true to the spirit of the Creed — perhaps assisted by some tremendous, and as it seems to me wholly illegal, aid, from the respected Trustees. One is: why did the Founders require a renewal of subscription once in five years; the other, what did they think was meant when they said so much, and when so much was said in their presence, in regard to the possible removal of Professors; and as to what should be done in that contingency?

The exercises at the opening of the Institution on the 28th Sept. 1808, began with prayer by the Rev. Jonathan French. This was followed by the reading of the *Historic Sketch*, to which I have before referred, of the circumstances which had led to the service of that day. Dr. Pearson, who had left Harvard because Henry Ware had been chosen Hollis Professor, and who had been the prime mover in the work on the side of the Old Calvinists, added that the motives, views and expectations of the Founders as to all this, would fully appear from their Statutes, which were then read in full; thus publicly emphasizing on this founding day the unalterable character of the doctrinal basis of the Institution. Dr. Pearson's *Historic Sketch* with the Constitution and the Additional and Associate Statutes [*The Constitution and Associate Statutes of the Theological Seminary in Andover; with a Sketch of its Rise and Progress*. Published by order of the Trustees, Boston, 1808. 8° pp. 68] was published by the Trustees. It was at once reviewed [1808, pp. 613, 611, 614] by the *Monthly Anthology*, the Unitarian Organ, which — not unnaturally — particularly denounced this tying up of the Professors to an unchanging and unchangeable Creed. It said:

Its effects must be deadly to the best feelings of the minds of the Professors. . . . In other communions if a man can, at the period of signing, conscientiously believe the Creed, his mind is afterwards comparatively free. But these unhappy men are never out of chains. It will never be safe for them to exercise their minds on the objections which may be offered to the minutest article of their Creed. Their interest and their duty must be perpetually at war. They have a code of propositions put into their hands, in which all their inquiries must terminate, under the penalty of the loss of their station and its advantages. It is their interest never to improve or modify any one of their opinions. . . . This operates as a temptation and premium to dishonesty. . . . Such are the horrible principles on which this Institution is founded, that the venerable Watts himself, if he had been a Professor in it, must, in his old age, have been turned on the world to trust

to the charity of his friends. What must be the effect of such an institution on the minds of the Professors, and what its effect on those they are to instruct? We dare not trust ourselves with attempting to predict it.

The *Panoplist* [vol. iv. p. 480], which was the Orthodox monthly of those days, and was edited by a Trustee, replied to this. But what did it say? Did it deny that the Founders intended to bind the Professors by the Creed for all time? Did it deny that they were so bound; and that the Creed itself was so bound? Not at all. But it insisted that the Professors so bound were not debarred from free inquiry, and went on:

They know, indeed, when they accept an office in the Institution, they do it upon the condition, that, if their opinion of the Creed *should* alter, they are to relinquish their office. If they are honest men, they will rise above any temptation from this quarter, and will never violate a good conscience by subscribing what they do not believe. Much less will they wish to pervert the design of such a Seminary, by introducing sentiments repugnant to its excellent Constitution and Statutes.

In the autumn of 1818, Dr. Porter, then Bartlet Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, preached the sermon at the dedication of the Chapel. In that sermon [p. 14] he said:

The Professors of this Institution assent to the Creed of its Founders, not as a ceremony of induction into office; not because it was, substantially, the Creed of the great Reformers and of the New England Fathers; but because in their view, it accords with the Word of God. They are at perfect liberty to renounce these opinions and embrace others; *but in that case, they are bound, as honest and honorable men, to relinquish their present station.*

In 1819 some person who called himself “a Lover of the Truth” — he seems to have loved it from a Unitarian point of view — published a pamphlet to which he added “Some Remarks on the Andover Institution.” I will read a few lines from it [*The Trial: Calvin and Hopkins vs. The Bible and Common Sense*, etc., p. 28], as going to show what the outside public then understood the facts in the case to be:

I leave it to those who dispassionately consider present occurrences, and the probability of future results; whether an Institution established on such principles, to which its Professors, fautors and pupils *must* adhere, is calculated to do more good or evil in the circle of its influence?

On the 13th Sept. 1821, Prof. Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature, preached the sermon at the dedication of Bartlet Hall, which was published. In it he spoke as follows

[*Sermon occasioned by the Completion of the New College Edifice, etc.*, pp. 26-28]:

It will be seen, by this sketch, that the Founders of the Seminary were sincerely and earnestly bent upon preserving, as pure as possible, the principles on which it had been established; and that every thing which human wisdom and foresight could do to accomplish this, has already been done. We are aware that this arrangement has excited much animadversion; but we are not able to perceive any impropriety in it. Had not the Founders, sincerely believing as they did that the principles of their Creed were truly Christian, and such as the great body of the pious in every age of the Church had maintained, a right to bestow their property in such a way as to maintain those principles, when they were removed from the present scene of action? If you deny this, you deny liberty of conscience, and the liberty of Christians. If you admit it, then you justify the measures which they have taken.

Will it be said that the *consciences* of men are bound by such a measure; that Christian and Protestant freedom of investigation is denied to the Officers and Students of this Seminary; and that inquiry and all improvement in respect to the doctrines of Theology are at an end, among those who submit to such requisitions in the true spirit of them? I know this has been said. But if it may appear plausible in theory, it has very little concern with practice. The Instructors in this Seminary must be supposed to have formed their opinion about the great points of theology before they are elected to office here. If they subscribe *ex animo* to the Creed, they may surely do it with entire integrity. If, in the course of future investigation, they alter their opinions in respect to any doctrines of the Creed, nothing prevents the alteration. They are at liberty, as much as any other men on earth. They make no promise not to change their opinions, express or implied. *But the Founders have provided that, in case of such a change, they cannot be retained in their service.* They [i.e., the Founders] have the same right to do this as they had to espouse the principles of religion which they have adopted; the same right that a parish has to employ such a minister as it would prefer; the common, unalienable right of all men, to appropriate their property to build up the Church in that method which they judge proper, provided it do not infringe on the similar rights of their neighbors. They had the same right to annex such a condition to the tenure of Professorship here, that a man has, in any case, to annex a condition to the enjoyment of a gift which he has bestowed. *And if a Professor has common honesty, he can never subscribe to the Creed, unless he really believes it. If he assents to this Creed, and then inculcates principles contrary to it, he surely is not a man who ought to be retained in any important post of the Church. If in the course of his investigations he become satisfied, that any of the principles of his Creed are substantially incorrect, then let him openly and honestly abandon a place which he cannot conscientiously hold.* If for the paltry consideration of retaining his salary, he will do violence to his conscience, and conceal his sentiments, there is no human remedy for it; *but if he develops them, the Statutes of the Founders must be executed. Why should they not? And what complaint could he have to make, if they should be?* He accepted the office with a full knowledge of all the circumstances.

With a prophetic insight this noble Professor seems to have looked forward to this very day, and anticipated the exact calamity which has called us here. And what did he say? [*Ibid.* p. 36]:

This Seminary is indeed consecrated to Christ and the Church; it is guarded by all the ramparts, which paper Constitutions and Legislative acts and contracts can erect. So have others been, that are now arrayed against the faith which they were established to defend and to propagate. Let the majority of our Legislators and Judges, our *Trustees* and other Officers of this Seminary, *once come to view the principles on which it is founded, as erroneous, or superstitious*, and all our paper ramparts vanish, at the first assault.

And then, explaining why he has thought it fit to say such things, he goes on to remark [*Ibid.* p. 37]:

For what end, you may ask, is such an attempt to create alarm? My answer is ready. For this end; that you may see and feel, that the safety and purity of this Institution depend, after all, on God only; and be led suitably to acknowledge Him, so that He may direct its paths. Trust not in any arm of flesh. *You have, and from the very nature of the case you can have, no other assurance that this Seminary will not be arrayed, the very next generation, against the faith which it now inculcates, but the protection and blessing of Almighty God.*

Now, is it conceivable that such language as this could have been employed on a festive occasion in the presence of the munificent Donor of the building which they had assembled to dedicate, and of Moses Brown his Associate Founder; and in the presence of his Honor William Phillips, and Hon. John Phillips and Hon. Jonathan Phillips, of Dr. Eliphalet Pearson, of Dr. Jedidiah Morse, of Dr. Abiel Holmes, of Hon. Samuel H. Walley, and of Mark Newman and Samuel Farrar, Trustees; and of Hon. George Bliss, Dr. Calvin Chapin, and Dr. Jeremiah Day, Visitors; and then been printed with their license and laud, unless it voiced a principle as to whose truth, and whose importance for the welfare of the Seminary, they had — and knew of — but one opinion?

I am aware that the Respondent and his learned counsel talk about “substantial agreement” with this Creed. Well, Gentlemen, we too believe in “substantial” agreement — in its place, and to its outermost just and honorable limit, as really and truly as they can. But that limit must exist, and it must lie somewhere within the bounds of safety. When the physician prescribes for your child milk and water, half and half; “substantial agreement” with his direction is near enough, without weighing or

measuring either the milk or the water. But how about "substantial agreement" with that physician's recipe, when the dear child's life hangs in the balance, and heroic treatment is involved, and the chemist must open his deadliest poison bottles to compound the dose? I rather think we all want more than "substantial agreement," in such a case as that.

So, further, we are told that the body of the Creed is to be interpreted by the concluding promise: "according to the best light God shall give me;" as if, if God should not give light enough for such a Professor to believe in the "infallible Revelation," or in the "three Persons" of the Godhead, or in that clause which declares that "by nature every man is personally depraved," or in any other of the doctrines previously enumerated; that fact is to discharge him of all obligation to believe and teach them. But this forgets — I should say ignores — the two conclusive counter facts — that the Professor's promise distinctly is that he will "maintain and inculcate the Christian faith *as expressed in the Creed*" according to the best light which God shall give him; and that his work shall be done according to the best light which God shall give him — *in "opposition" to the heresies and errors* which, when he subscribes the Creed, he goes on to enumerate. Here he is beset behind and before by the intense and pronounced Orthodoxy of the Symbol, and he cannot flee from its presence.

And, if you look at the matter on the plane of every-day common sense, it becomes easy to see that a more palpable absurdity could hardly be framed into speech, than the claim which our friends here make. You say to your son: "go to Charleston, S.C." He asks "how?" And you answer: "go according to the best light God shall give you." Now he might — in summer-time — paddle thither in a canoe; and that would be good for his arms. He might walk; and that would be good for his legs. He might go on horse-back; and that would be excellent for his general health. He might go in Dr. Holmes's "one-hoss shay," and, if it didn't break down, it might prove a very agreeable method of transit. He might hire a yacht, or a two-horse coach, and that would be bad for his purse, and probably for yours. He might go by steamer, or go by train. And I am not prepared to say that you could exactly condemn him, if, by whichever method, he safely reached his journey's end — on his serious insistence that he had felt it to be his heaven-revealed and solemn duty to choose the course which he actually took. But I *am* sure

that just cause of complaint would lie against him in your mind, should he have gone to Malaga in Spain, or to Canton in China, when you ordered him to go to Charleston, S.C.

Or we will suppose the Respondent, being about to visit Europe, to desire to invest a portion of the profits of *Progressive Orthodoxy* in a new house on some one of the sweet and sunlit slopes of Andover hill. He favors — being conservative in tastes — a large double house with Grecian pillars, and an ample hall running through the centre, with space, taste and comfort on either hand. He has his plans drawn therefor, and puts all into the hands of an architect in whom he confides, but adds to the minute drawings and exact verbal specifications this final clause :

And it is further agreed that the said architect shall give to his employer the benefit of his best supervisory skill; and, as a man of learning and experience in his profession, shall introduce any such improvements, in harmony with the main design, as, during the progress of the work, may suggest themselves as of real value to the best completeness of the same.

The Respondent hears from the work with great regularity during his absence in the way of a call for remittances; and when it is complete starts for home, in the feeling that though it has cost more than he intended, it will offer him a charming retreat for the rest of his days. He has seen it a good deal in his mind's eye while absent. As the express spins by Ballardvale, he glances toward those well-remembered heights where his new home ought to be gleaming between the trees — but fails to catch the desired gleam. The architect meets him at the station, however, and on the way up in the coach, says that he has made rather more of that last clause than he originally intended; but, as he has put the most advanced thought, and his own best and most conscientious work, into it, he hopes for approval. They alight before a structure — occupying precisely the prescribed external feet and inches in every direction; but all else how changed! In place of the serene and classic shape assigned, behold a mixture of Queen Anne, and King Yankee; with bulges here, bay-windows there and pinnacles above; all coated with fish-scale shingles and painted in all the colors of the rainbow; the calm and large interior cut up into petty receptacles for *bric-à-brac*, and faithfully diversified with all the modern appliances of pretentious ill taste and laborious discomfort!

Now, my friend, the Respondent wouldn't use any *bad* language

on such an occasion, but I can conceive of his resorting to words of considerable strength. And it would not surprise me, if, by the time he had freed his mind in regard to the way in which that fatal "last clause" had been worked in the case, the poor architect should be in the condition of a man whom I once heard tremendously scarified in Court by the eloquent father of the distinguished professor from Yale on the other side of the table; the man being then and there reported to be endeavoring "to charter knot-holes for two!"

How refreshing it is to turn from all such forms of dealing with the Andover Creed, to a deliverance like that of a former professor, published in the *Congregationalist* of 14 June, 1882, a portion of which is as follows:

The Statutes of the Seminary require a rigid assent to the letter of the Creed on the part of all persons subscribing it; the Boards of administration, however, accept a general and approximate belief in the doctrines of the Creed as the sufficient prerequisite to subscription. But the honesty of such general and approximate subscription has of late been publicly and extensively called in question; yet the Trustees are disinclined publicly to acknowledge and vindicate it.

To remain in my office, therefore, would be to remain constantly exposed to the charge, or the suspicion, of dishonesty without prospect of open vindication, and with the certainty that whatever I might say in my own defence would be largely neutralized.

In justice alike to the Trustees and to myself I must add, that our personal relations are, and always have been, most kindly. The problem which confronts them is one of extreme gravity and delicacy. They express their willingness still to accept from me a qualified subscription. Such a subscription, while it has hitherto been satisfactory to me (and still is so far as my private relations to them are concerned), has ceased to be so, because, by reason of recent discussions, it places both me and the Seminary in a false position before the public.

But it is asked, Why do you not remain at your post and labor there to bring about a change?

I reply, first, because my obligation to be, and be known to be, an honest man outweighs all other obligations to Trustees or Seminary; and secondly, because, by resigning my position for the reason given, I seem to myself to be doing what little I can towards bringing about a change indispensable to the prosperity of the Seminary.

Yours truly,

J. HENRY THAYER.

ANDOVER, June 8, 1882.

Gentlemen, I maintain that if there be one scrap or particle in the Andover Creed, which by any twisting could be strained to seem to favor such a doctrine as that in question, it must have

gotten in there surreptitiously ; because from the day of the Crucifixion down to the laying of the top stone of the first Andover building, almost every human being from whose influence, early or late, such insertion could come, had been of another way of thinking, and had been urgently of that other way. A man of ordinary common sense, and some little knowledge of natural history, does not need to break the egg of an ostrich, to determine that neither the embryo of a canary, a cat-bird, a crow nor a crocodile is housed therein. And the Andover Creed we have seen is such in origin, as a whole, as not only to warrant us in the *a priori* security that the notion of probation after death cannot be found therein, but to compel us to conclude that did any clause of the instrument seem for a moment construable that way, it ought to be construed in some other way of better harmony with the scope of the instrument, if any such course be possible. If my plough brings up a little iron box having the rust of centuries upon it, and on breaking it open I find gold and silver coins within ; I have better warrant to believe them the genuine product of their mints, of their dates given, than when I buy coins of the merchants in these days of imposture. Therefore I insist that, as its position and surroundings control the just interpretation of any document, pre-eminently this reasoning removes the Andover Creed from every possibility of a lawfully lax rendering in the particular before us.

III. *I now proceed to set forth in specific detail the evidence that Prof. Egbert Coffin Smyth, the Respondent, is heterodox and guilty of failure to maintain and inculcate the Creed of the Seminary, and the "true intention" of the Founders as expressed in their Statutes, in believing, maintaining and inculcating that there is and will be probation after death for all men who do not decisively reject Christ during the earthly life. I shall call your attention to several particulars, in their order, as suggested by the progress of thought and language in the Associate Statutes.*

1. The Second Article of the said Associate Statutes requires that the said Respondent "sustain the character" — among other things — of "an Orthodox and consistent Calvinist;" and he has again and again "solemnly promised" to sustain that character; while it is in the nature of things impossible for any man to maintain and inculcate the hypothesis of probation after this life, and at the same time be "an Orthodox and consistent Calvinist."

This, Gentlemen of the Visitors, is a proposition abundantly capable of being maintained on abstract grounds, and by comparison of the hypothesis referred to with the fundamental principles, and only logical and congruous outcomes, of Calvinism. Although it was not a matter so lying in his way as to call for any special treatment, yet Calvin himself, in passing, made known more than once his distinct view in regard to it. In the third Book of the *Institutes* [III. 25 (6)] he says :

There can be no doubt that the reprobate have the same doom as that which Jude assigns to the devils, they are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day" [Jude 6].

And in his *Psychopannychia*, or refutation of the notion that the soul sleeps from death to judgment [*Tracts*, iii. 449], he says :

As long as it is in the body it [the soul] exerts its own powers; but when it quits this prison-house it returns to God, whose presence it meanwhile enjoys while it rests in the hope of a blessed Resurrection. This rest is its paradise. On the other hand, the spirit of the reprobate, while it waits for the dreadful judgment, is tortured by that anticipation, which the Apostle for that reason calls φοβερών (fearful). To inquire beyond this is to plunge into the abyss of the Divine mysteries.

So Calvin. What Calvinists since his time have held to be Orthodox and consistent Calvinism on the subject, their symbolic literature which I have already cited, has abundantly made manifest.

But the truth is, that this is a specific and not a general statement. The phrase here employed, "an Orthodox and consistent Calvinist," had, at the time when this Creed was framed, and in the minds of the men who framed it, a limited and technical sense. It was in that sense that they employed it, and by that sense we are legally as well as morally bound to interpret it. Prof. Greenleaf in his standard *Treatise on the Law of Evidence* [i. sec. 295] lays it down that parol testimony is admissible to show that words which may have two meanings, one common and universal, the other technical, peculiar, or local, are used in the latter sense, and to ascertain that technical or local meaning. "The same principle," he adds, "is also applied in regard to words and phrases, used in a peculiar sense by members of a particular religious sect;" which *dictum* he fortifies by a long note of reference to the case of Lady Hewley's charities, and the action of the Vice Chancellor thereon, afterwards confirmed by Lord Lyndhurst, and still again

by the House of Lords. The Respondent himself has told us that "words and phrases *must* have their historic sense."

The question then becomes: what was that technical historic sense which, in the beginning of the present century, in New England, commonly attached to the designation a "consistent Calvinist," in which sense it went into the Creed?

In the *Life and Times of Gardiner Spring, D.D.* [i: 21] it is stated that Chief Justice Theophilus Parsons, who lived in Newburyport, and, himself a Unitarian, was fond of discussing theology with his neighbor Dr. Samuel Spring, — chief of the Hopkinsian originators of the Andover Creed, — was wont to say: "Dr. Spring is right; he is a *consistent* Calvinist; for, if I were a Calvinist at all I could not stop this side of Hopkinsianism." Dr. Emmons [*Life*, 422] used to say "some theologians are Calvinisticalish; some Calvinistical, some Calvinistic; I am a Consistent Calvinist," — this, because he held that Hopkinsianism, as he believed and taught it — in strongly presenting on the one side the adorable sovereignty of God, and, on the other, the deplorable sinfulness of man, with their related harmonizing truths — set forth Scriptural Calvinism in its only self-consistent and efficient form. And, when the Hopkinsians were denounced by the Old Calvinists — some of whom, under that name, were really inculcating semi-Arminianism — as being at least semi-heretics, they were in the habit of retorting that, so far from being heretics, they were the only *consistent* Calvinists." In this sense the phrase occurs in the correspondence preliminary to the Creed. Dr. Woods [*Appendix*, p. 482] wrote to Dr. Spring in April 1807:

I consider thorough *consistent Calvinism* to be Divine truth. And when I name *Calvinism*, I mean the system which the most enlightened and respectable Hopkinsians embrace.

So, in the spring of 1807, he earnestly pleaded with Dr. Spring [*Ibid.* 486] to withdraw his opposition to the union of the two Seminaries because if one were left to be established at Andover by itself, it would have great advantages; "America, England, and Scotland would be searched for professors, whose name should be popular and famous;" it would doubtless get the most students, and be the most popular institution, and — here is the grand rub:

All the students coming from the [that] Seminary will be in danger of having their minds prejudiced, in some measure, against *consistent Calvinism*; and so the desirable effects of impartial inquiry and clear gospel light will be obstructed.

The first Abbot Professor of Christian Theology, understood the phrase, and constantly used it, in this sense. He said [*Woods*, p. 102] :

Some who called themselves "liberal Christians" endeavored to stigmatize it [the Creed] by calling it a Hopkinsian Creed ; and so they would have called any creed which contained thorough and *consistent Calvinism*.

He said [*Ibid.* p. 103] that the Creed was "purely and *consistently Calvinistic*," and [*Ibid.* p. 107] that he had been chosen Professor in consequence of the knowledge of his views and principles of "*consistent Calvinism*."

Now, I maintain that this, and no other, was the sense in which the phrase came into the Creed, and that when all parties to the transaction agreed to require that every Professor on the Associate Foundation should promise and covenant to be "an Orthodox and consistent Calvinist" what they meant was that he should agree to be at basis a *Hopkinsian*, except so far as that character might in some particulars have been slightly modified by subsequent clauses, to which all had agreed, in the Creed.

We have seen what Dr. Hopkins taught, and what his pupils held, as to probation after death ; and it will at once be conceded, on all hands, that there is nothing in the Creed to require a Hopkinsian to believe on that subject differently from Dr. Hopkins himself. Therefore, in holding, maintaining and inculcating the possibility of probation after this life, the Respondent violates his pledge as to this clause of the Creed.

2. The 20th distinct and separate doctrinal statement in the Creed is that "the ordinary means, by which these benefits [that is, the "benefits of redemption"] are communicated to us, are the Word, Sacraments and prayer." As, now, it appears to be in the nature of things impossible for these means to be active after death, we claim that, in believing, maintaining and inculcating the hypothesis of probation after death, the Respondent violates his promise to hold and teach this Article of the Creed. The word "ordinary" primarily means according to established order. Its next sense is *usual* — that is "that which, in the common order and succession of things, almost always takes place." Crabb, in his *English Synonymes Explained*, illustrates the sense by citing this passage from Burke :

It was in the most patient period of Roman Servitude that themes of tyrannicide made the *ordinary* exercises of boys at school.

But Burke never could have said this if he had understood the fact to be, that only once in one hundred, or once in fifty, or once in twenty-five, or once in ten cases, were such themes made the exercises of boys at school. And, surely, the framers of the Creed never would have said that men are *ordinarily* converted to God by means of "the Word, Sacraments and prayer," if they had supposed it to be the fact that millions more souls will be in Heaven who have been converted to God by *post-mortem* mercies, of whose nature we are not informed further than that we seem to be authorized to be very sure that the Word and the Sacraments cannot be among them, than have been converted to God in this world by their gracious help.

More than half of the race is extinguished in infancy. There are sad multitudes who lack the imperial gift of reason. And the pagan nations which live and die and know not God, have always appallingly outnumbered, and outnumber still, those over whom the radiance from the cross has streamed. Now, the Respondent asks [*Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 251]:

Are all these multitudes, through so many generations, hopelessly lost? . . . Must we, can we, believe that they are eternally damned? Is it possible that God will never bring to them the light and motive of the gospel of Jesus Christ?

And, in exposition of his theory of the way in which salvation may come to such souls in the next world, he [*Ibid.* p. 253] says:

The revelation given in the disembodied state may be so luminous that the actual time will scarcely be appreciable between the moment of death, and the moment when Christ is decisively accepted or rejected. And yet, with some, we can easily imagine that protracted processes of education and discipline may be necessary to make them ripe for decision.

His whole theory asks acceptance on the ground of the immeasurable relief which it offers to the mind in making it hypothetically possible, if not indeed prevailingly probable, that uncounted millions — the vast majority of mankind — whose salvation was by the old Orthodoxy supposed to be impossible, by the *post-venient* grace of the Progressive Orthodoxy may be saved, in Hades. Then what becomes of his agreement to hold and teach that "the Word, Sacraments and prayer" are the "*ordinary* means of human salvation?

I do not press this point as one to which, did it stand alone, vital importance need attach, but that we may not overlook how

wide-spreading is the contamination of the Creed by the dry-rot of Dornerism in Eschatology.

3. The 24th distinct and separate doctrinal clause in the Creed pledges every Professor to believe, maintain and inculcate that "they who are effectually called, do in this life partake of justification, adoption and sanctification, and the several benefits which do either accompany or flow from them;" so that in teaching that those who die in impenitence will repent, or that they may repent, or that they can repent, in the future world, the Respondent violates his pledge to this Article of the Creed.

I recognize, Mr. President, the acute and conspicuous ability with which the Respondent has argued in regard to this matter. And, Sir, could this clause be looked at merely as so much language, separated from and excluded out of its place and purpose in this Symbol, one might grant to his reasoning a considerable show of justice. But, Sir, just as the body of each passenger in every coach of a train which is running at sixty miles the hour, shares that motion, and, so far as the track and the surrounding country are concerned, is rushing on at that tremendous rate — as he would find were he to jump out; although, so far as the car is concerned, at perfect rest in his seat; so the momentum of this whole Creed has been proved to be so conclusive in the direction of the ideas which presided over its birth, as to control, in large measure, the interpretation of its every clause. Any resolution passed by a convention of Democrats is entitled to a Democratic explanation over all others, where such an one is possible. And, for like reason, every sentence and member of this Creed that can be fairly construed toward another theory than that of probation after this life ought to be so construed, because we know that its Founders, and their abettors, would all have died martyrs before they would knowingly have sanctioned what they regarded as so grievous and dangerous a heresy.

This clause of the Creed is taken almost *ipsissimis verbis* from the Shorter Catechism, where it makes the answer to the 32d question, which is abridged from and controlled by the Larger Catechism and Confession — it being the quintessence of the 10th Chapter of the Confession, "Of Effectual Calling." Without further argument I submit, that, since God's purposes for human salvation are herein declared to take effect for that salvation only through the effectual calling of His Holy Spirit; and that effectual calling is declared to do its work only in this life; it becomes im-

possible to see how in the good faith of the Creed there can be penitence and forgiveness in the future life, or how the Respondent is able in Christian honesty, through *Progressive Orthodoxy*, to "maintain and inculcate" that men, and even the great majority of men, may repent and be saved in Hades, while quinquennially pledging himself to teach that no man can be saved, except he be effectually called in this life.

4. The 26th doctrinal clause of the Creed is, that "the wicked will awake to shame and everlasting contempt, and with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone for ever and ever." We claim that this awaking is from the unconsciousness which accompanies death, and that what the clause means to say, and what, properly construed, it does say, is that, so soon as the impenitent soul becomes conscious of a change of worlds, it becomes conscious that its destiny is forever fixed in the dreadful conditions which are described; and we claim that, having promised to maintain and inculcate this belief, the Respondent is false to that pledge in teaching that there may be salvation beyond the grave. I understand the Respondent substantially to assert that, as the previous clause, in so many words, states that "the souls of believers are *at their death* made perfect in holiness, and *do immediately pass into glory*," and, as there is here the omission of any distinct averment that "at death" the wicked will awake, etc., or that they "are immediately cast into hell," etc., that it becomes legitimate to infer that ages may pass after death before their final condition shall be fixed, during which they may repent and be saved. As — aside from a claimed general flavor of weakness in that direction — this — not very wide — crevice is the only one in the Creed into which the Respondent himself ventures to believe, or dares to claim, that it is possible to thrust the neo-probational theories, it will be well to glance for a moment at the elements which must govern a fair judgment of such a claim.

(1) In the first place, by the uniform *usus loquendi* of the Confession, and the Catechism, and all their literature, the "wicked" means those who persist in sin and die in impenitence. Now, if the previous clause with reference to the righteous, came verbatim from the Catechisms, equally did this one come from the prophecy of Daniel [xii: 2] in rendering which the revisers have endorsed, letter by letter, the authorized version: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt;" where the two

cases of the righteous and the wicked — that is, of those who died believers, and of those who died unbelievers — are put into the parallelism of a perfectly balanced antagonism. It seems, beyond question, then, that the framers of the Creed supposed themselves to be making an assertion as to what was to happen to those who died wicked, so soon as they began to awake to consciousness that they were dead.

(2) But, if we grant that no immediate and instantaneous link binds the thought of what is here asserted of the wicked to their first conscious moment after death, and that ages of new probationary privilege may be fairly imagined to come in here, what follows, from the inevitable force of the language, but that this new probationary opportunity meets with the same deplorable fate with the former, and avails but to add to the guilt and wretchedness of those who were guilty and wretched enough before; since the Creed insists — surely they are not to believe in Christ and be saved while still asleep — that the wicked, *whenever they do awake*, “awake to shame and everlasting contempt” to “be plunged with devils” into the direful lake. There is here no suggestion of the remotest possibility that there can, under any circumstances or at any period of eternity, be any other than this fearful awaking in reserve for them.

(3) I insist, then, that the only fair interpretation of this clause is that which makes it follow the silence of the Shorter Catechism — to which, in its place, I referred — with reference to any assertion of the *immediateness* of the entrance of the dead sinner upon his impending doom; on the ground that it was implied in what was antithetically said of the immediateness of the entrance of the righteous upon their state of reward, and sufficiently suggested by the suggestiveness of the text itself of the prophet Daniel which was employed. I am wholly unable, therefore, to see how the Respondent avoids infidelity to this clause of the Creed which he binds himself to maintain.

5. The 30th doctrinal clause of the Creed is this: “that man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him, so that nothing but the sinner’s aversion to holiness prevents his salvation.” This the Respondent stands sacredly pledged to believe, maintain and inculcate. But if nothing but a man’s own fault stands between him and a given result, then he has a “fair chance” for that result. If nothing but “my aversion” to take the next train to New York prevents my taking that

train, then I have a "fair chance" to take that train. This is not said of any particular man, or men, but of man as such, and in virtue of his humanity. He may be the most gifted and cultured graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. He may be a New Hampshire farmer. He may be a Digger Indian. But of him, high or low, Pagan or Puritan, the Creed says—"nothing" but his own "aversion to holiness prevents his salvation." He may have the Catechism at his tongue's end; he may "know nothing of the historical Christ and the redemption that is in Him" [*Prog. Orth.* p. 63.]; and yet—all are on the same level as to that—according to the Creed, "*nothing* but his aversion to holiness prevents his salvation." Every man, who is a man, and "has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him," according to the Creed—and according to Prof. Smyth, when once in five years he says: "I believe and will teach the Creed," has a fair chance. If he have a fair chance God treats him justly. Yet, in *Progressive Orthodoxy* [p. 64] the Respondent says:

We may go so far as to say that *it would not be just* for God to condemn men hopelessly when they have not known Him as He really is, when they have not known Him in Jesus Christ.

But if there be one man on earth who has not known God the Father in Jesus Christ, who yet has "understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him," he has a fair chance, even if he be so unfortunate as not to have known God in Jesus Christ. And, if he have a fair chance and reject God, it is just for God to condemn him for so doing. And, once in five years, in taking the Creed, the Respondent says it is just, while the rest of the time in *Progressive Orthodoxy* he says it is not just.

6. The 33d clause of the Creed requires every Professor on the Associate Foundation solemnly to promise: "that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the Creed, by me now repeated, together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion, so far as may appertain to my office, according to the best light God shall give me, and in opposition, not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists, and to all heresies and errors ancient or modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men." We charge that the Respondent is

guilty of infidelity to this clause, and of violation of this solemn promise, in maintaining and inculcating, in the face of it, the doctrine of probation after death.

The first question concerning this Article must, of course, be one of construction — of the ascertainment of what precisely the Founders designed to be the force of it. It is impossible that they intended to pledge their Associate Professors blindly to oppose, and flatly to antagonize, all these heretics and errorists *in all respects and every particular*; for, with their various errors and heresies, they hold a great deal of truth which cannot be gainsaid. All except the first-named, for example, agree in affirming the Divine existence; so that what is meant must be other than that. We are indebted to the Respondent, and his associates, for a good if not entirely satisfactory rule to be here applied. In a letter, signed by himself and five others who were then his associates, of date 10 April 1882, which was published in the *Congregationalist* of 12 April 1882, he, and they, said:

Any interpretation of the Andover Creed which opens the door to any specified heresy [the connection shows that what was meant was “to any of the heresies which it specifies”] is illegitimate. On the other hand, its correlative Articles are properly held so long as the truths are maintained which exclude these specified errors.

We need have no controversy over this: he cannot object to it, and we will not. And now I charge him, in the maintenance and inculcation of the dogma of probation after death, with opening the door to more than one of those specified heresies which he stands pledged to oppose, and with failing to maintain the truths which exclude those specified errors.

If the question respects whether, in advocating the continuance of probation after death, he is teaching what is *now* a distinguishing doctrine of Universalism and Unitarianism, there could be but one possible answer. The latest, and in some respects, in our language, ablest, work on *The History of Christian Doctrine*, by Prof. Sheldon of the Boston University [ii: 397] says:

Modern Unitarians are very largely inclined to Restorationism, regarding future punishment as amendatory in its design, and Future Probation, with its far-reaching opportunities, as likely to ultimate, on the part of all, in the choice of goodness.

That “Statement of Belief” unanimously adopted 30 Oct., 1878, by the Unitarian Association of New Hampshire, which,

more than any other formula, has been accepted and used by Unitarians in general as fairly stating their characteristic belief, on this subject says :

There is no reason to suppose that death either causes the remission of penalties, or shuts out opportunities of repentance.

And, five-and-twenty years ago, the Rev. W. R. Alger, in his learned treatise entitled *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, declared it to be the refined and final shape which the doctrine of Universalism has taken [p. 429] :

That the freedom and probation granted here extend into the life to come; that the aim of all future punishment will be remedial, beneficent, not revengeful; that stronger motives will be applied for producing repentance, and grander attractions to holiness be felt; and that thus, at some time or other, even the most sunken and hardened souls will be regenerated and raised up to heaven in the image of God. Many Universalists, most Unitarians, and large numbers of individuals outwardly affiliated with other denominations, now accept and cherish this theory.

And again [p. 564] he says :

The conditions and means of repentance, reformation, regeneration, are always within its [the soul's] power, the future state being but the unencumbered, intensified experience of the spiritual elements of the present, under the same Divine constitution and laws. This is the belief of *Unitarians*, *Restorationists*, and the general body of believers known as "Liberal Christians."

Here it is in place to refer to the opinion of the learned Quarterly of the Universalist denomination, the *Universalist Review*, which [July 1886, p. 373] wound up its criticism of *Progressive Orthodoxy* with these words :

We close here, with the remark before made, *that the trend of the "Progressive Orthodoxy" is inevitably toward Universalism*. Its advocates must either call a halt and a retreat, or be pushed by the force of logic and the demands of the confessed "ethical consciousness," to the only possible resting place, the assurance that all sin must be destroyed, all sin be finished, the holiness of all souls be secured by Almighty Wisdom and Love.

But the Creed was adopted by the Founders in 1808, and we should fairly inquire what *they* meant by Universalism ; what was the Universalism of that time, which they knew, dreaded, and desired to pledge all their Professors to oppose? When this century came in there were scarcely five-and-twenty Universalist preachers in the country, and that denomination was but just

springing into life. It was, yet, exceedingly active. Between 1779 and 1808 there were in New England as many as one hundred and thirty publications upon the subject, and the Founders thought it to be seriously menacing the general welfare, when they were planning and toiling towards their Seminary. So far as the neighborhood of Andover was concerned, John Murray *was* Universalism, for substance, then. Nearing the end of his career, he was, when they were signing the Creed, in his fifteenth year as pastor of the First Universalist Society in Boston; having for many previous years been laboring largely at Gloucester, where, 1 Jan. 1779, he had led in the establishment of what is held to be the earliest organization of American Universalists. A man, it would seem, of singular fascination in the pulpit, with some powers which appear to have been really very remarkable, and with an immense—and, so to speak, fluent familiarity with the Scriptures—he no doubt exercised an exceedingly wide popular influence. For more than a quarter of a century laboring thus within twenty-five miles—on the one side or the other—of most of these Founders, there can be no question that they especially deplored his influence. The younger President Edwards even had thought his labors of sufficient consequence for public animadversion in *Brief Observations on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation as lately promulgated by Murray the Universalist* [i: 279] and many other Divines had referred to him both in the pulpit and the press. Clearly, then, at least one great thought,—if not *the* great thought—in the Founders' mind when in the Creed they mentioned Universalism as an error to be antagonized, was of this man, his labors and opinions; and one thing which they especially meant to pledge their Professors to do must have been to maintain and inculcate the Christian faith in opposition to him, and what they regarded as his pestilent heresies. Even in the absence of direct testimony one can infer when materials of inference are at hand. If a ship be sinking in mid-ocean one can guess some of the thoughts and feelings and speech of the endangered passengers, without being there to take notes. And when New England was in that case that many felt her richest ventures of faith to be in imminent danger of foundering in the deep sea of unbelief, it becomes easy to know what good people meant by what they said.

Now, Gentlemen, what was the Universalism of John Murray? It was a very different Universalism from that of to-day. So to say, it was a very much more Orthodox Universalism than that of

to-day, by which I mean that it had a great deal more of old-fashioned Orthodoxy lying around loose in it. John Murray was a Calvinist "for substance of doctrine," and I quote the late Dr. Hosea Ballou 2d, D.D., when I say that his Universalism "was based exclusively on the fact of the union of all men with Christ." And to cite the learned historian of the Universalist denomination, the Rev. Dr. Eddy [*Universalism in America*, i: 152]:

All men, he held, were really in Adam, and sinned in him, not by a fictitious imputation, but by actual participation; equally so are all men in the second Adam.

He reasoned mainly from the absoluteness and unboundedness of the attributes of God. He was especially jubilant over his conception of the universality of the Atonement, and from this glorious fact he continually reasoned that somewhere and somehow, and at some time, all men will come to the knowledge of Christ. Now the main point to which I desire to call your attention is the fact that John Murray was led to advocate — as nearly as I can understand it — that exact hypothesis of possible future probation which the Respondent holds and inculcates. Let me call your attention to some proofs of this, taken from *Letters and Sketches of Sermons, by John Murray, Senior Pastor of the First Universal Society in Boston*, Boston, 1812-13, thus:

To assert that God cannot manifest himself and his redeeming grace to the soul which has departed from this state of things, is indeed most arrogantly to limit the Holy One of Israel. I might with infinitely more propriety assert, that I could not make you understand me, except you continued in this house. Our bodies are said to be *a house*. When *this house* of our earthly tabernacle is dissolved, etc. Can an Omnipotent God be *necessitated* to speak to the creature who is the work of his hand, in any particular place, or at any particular time? Is God obliged to speak to us in this house, and nowhere else? Can we not hear his voice, except we are encrusted in this earthly tenement? Cannot the children understand the sovereign goodness of paternal Deity elsewhere? If they cannot, what then must become of those infants — every infant who departs out of time? [i: 263].

Here was a whole world of unbelievers, who not only went out of the world in a state of unbelief, but were imprisoned in the same state for upwards of two thousand years. But, although the preaching of Noah could not convert them while in the body, the preaching of the Spirit of Jesus could when out of the body. . . . I never heard of any individual who had the boldness to affirm that *every* infant must be eternally damned. Yet if no human being can obtain life eternal without the knowledge of God, and if all these little human beings have not the knowledge of God in the present state, as it is notorious they have not the knowledge either of good

or evil; and if there be no knowledge of God, save what is communicated to the soul while in the body, then not some infants only, but every infant and idiot that ever came into this world, with almost all the rest of the human race, from the beginning of the world, will be banished from the presence of the Father of their spirits, etc. [i: 291].

F. Now you talk of the day of judgment, I wish you would give me your opinion of the state of departed spirits.

Murray. Why, Sir, I believe that until the second coming of our Saviour, they have a world of their own.

F. And do you think the world in which you suppose they are, is the residence of all departed spirits?

Murray. I do not; I believe all those who depart in the same frame of mind with the thief upon the cross, to whom our Saviour said, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise" will keep high holy day with God. In other words, I am of opinion, that the Assembly of Divines were perfectly correct, who say in their Catechism: "The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory" [i: 332].

Dr. N. I assert, Sir, that no one will ever be saved hereafter who does not believe in this world; for "now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation;" this is our state of probation.

Murray. Yes, Sir; now, and to eternity, will be the day of salvation. But what do you mean by the day of probation?

Dr. N. Why, Sir, if they do not improve the present time, they never will have another offer.

Murray. Another offer of what, Sir?

Dr. N. Of grace.

Murray. Does God offer grace to dead men? Is it not said, "Ye are dead, but your life is hid with Christ, in God."

Dr. N. Ay, that is spoken to believers only.

Murray. But our Apostle says: "the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, if one died for all then were all dead."

Dr. N. Well, Sir, notwithstanding this, there are none who will be saved eternally, who do not know God in this life, and believe in Jesus Christ.

Murray. Are you *sure* of this, Sir?

Dr. N. Yes, Sir, quite sure.

Murray. By what means are you assured?

Dr. N. By Scripture I am assured, and by reason I am assured.

Murray. Well, Sir, it is with a degree of painful pleasure, I presume to assure you, that both Scripture and reason are against you. The Scriptures declare that our Saviour, while his body continued in the sepulchre, was in spirit preaching to those imprisoned spirits who were sometime disobedient in the days of Noah.

Dr. N. Ay, but the Scriptures do not say they believed.

Murray. All who are taught by God's Spirit you will readily grant are believers.

Dr. N. I do not think the text you have mentioned hath any thing to do with the matter.

Murray. Well, then, Sir, quitting revelation, we will turn to reason.

There are many infants who pass out of this world without the knowledge of God. Do they never obtain the knowledge of God, etc., etc. [i: 396].

You would know if I conceive of any probationary state beyond the grave? . . .

What the Father of spirits will do with those who go out of the body without being made acquainted with the things that make for their peace, what will be the situation of such spirits, in a state of separation, until their reunion with their bodies, is not for me to determine. I think it possible to bring individuals acquainted with the truth while absent from the body, else I could have no reasonable hope that any infant could immediately be rendered happy. God, in his most holy Word hath given us assurance, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, to the glory of the Father; and as the *name* Jesus is literally Saviour, what is it, but that all shall confess him their Saviour, to the glory of the Father. But we do not see all men confess Jesus here, for all men have not faith, nor can they, until God shall graciously vouchsafe to bestow this blessing, for faith is the gift of God. Secret things belong to God, but things revealed, to us and our children. It is very plainly revealed, that Jesus is the Saviour of all men, and that he gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. But perhaps it is not so clearly revealed, when this due time will be. To confess the truth, I find it sufficient for me to consider every creature in the hand of God, whether in or out of the body. I can have no idea of any one making atonement for their own sins here, or hereafter, by any thing they can do or suffer. Jesus is a complete Saviour, or he is no Saviour at all [ii: 347].

When the sower of the evil seed, and all the evil seed sown, shall be separated from the seed which God sowed, then the seed which is properly the seed of God, will be like him, who sowed it, holy and pure, as God is holy and pure; when the veil shall be taken away, and the face of the covering from all people; every eye shall then see the Saviour as he is, and they who see him as he is, shall be like him, etc. [iii: 343].

Neither in life nor in death, in the body nor out of the body, can any of the ransomed of the Lord be saved from misery, until they are made acquainted with God as their Saviour. . . . Tears, weeping and wailing, will continue as long as unbelief, the procuring cause, shall remain. These evils will be done away together, not in the article of death, but in the day of the Lord, when every eye shall see and every tongue shall confess to the glory of the Father. . . . Why the Saviour does not do this now, I know not, any more than I know why he did not assume our nature a thousand years sooner than he did, or why he suffers any to pass out of this state of existence unacquainted with him, as their Saviour. . . . But we rest in full assurance, that the period will come, when every eye shall see, etc. . . . A *consistent Universalist* is made to understand that every man is as much interested in what our Emmanuel did as the second Adam, as they were in what was done by the first Adam . . . his hope extends to the final salvation of the great family of man [iii: 354, 355, 360, 362, 363].

There is no mistaking these passages. Over and over again, from different points of view, they set forth the doctrine of proba-

ble salvation in Hades. This seems to be, "for substance," the exact hypothesis of possible future probation, which the Respondent teaches. The Brown Professor's new light is then simply John Murray's old darkness! The Progressive Orthodoxy of Andover to-day, in this respect, appears to be neither more nor less than the second-hand Universalism of nine-and-seventy years ago, which the Respondent once in five years especially pledges himself to oppose, while at the same time publishing a volume which employs nearly seventy, out of two hundred and sixty-four pages, laboriously to advocate!

Again, Gentlemen, we maintain that the philosophy which underlies and justifies the Respondent's teaching of a possible future probation, is indistinguishable from that which underlies and justifies Universalism. Our unevangelical friends—as we have been wont to call many of those whom the Creed, in the clause under consideration, groups to condemn—have the same Bible which we have, and most of them claim to pay a like deference to it. Clearly, what makes them "unevangelical" is the philosophy which shapes their interpretation of the Word, and so evolves and fashions their doctrine. Now two factors necessarily control our understanding of any message; its language, and our conception of the sense in which that language has been employed. Thus, a man who is anxious to silence some utterer of unpleasant things, writes us: "find the slanderer, and if you can't stop him in any other way, *kill him*." But we know the writer to be impulsive, and given to extravagant utterance, and we never dream of putting any sense of homicide upon his words—only understanding that he is much in earnest in his desire. In precisely a like manner men's philosophy of the Divine character controls their interpretation of the Bible. The Calvinistic, and, to a large degree, the Evangelical, idea of God, emphasizes his infinite Holiness, Justice and Truth, and conceives of Him from the standpoint of a Ruler more than from that of a Father. Not denying that He is a Father, merciful and gracious; it yet looks at his Sovereignty as a greater fact about Him, whose claims must preponderate when his Fatherhood suggests conflict with it; after the same fashion as Valerius Maximus [*De Factis*, etc., v: 5 (3)] tells us that Zaleucus, the Locrrian law-giver, was controlled in his fatherhood by his position, in the case of his grossly-offending son. The Calvinist says: I am at a loss to know fully what God can mean by some of his tremendous utterances; but He would not so have spoken, if He had not so

meant ; so I will believe all I am able to believe, and trust Him for the rest. On the other hand the unevangelical idea of God thrusts to the front his paternal qualities, and so exalts them as necessarily regnant over his nature that he must, it reasons, be ready in their favor to sacrifice all considerations growing out of his relation as a ruler to men, when any conflict emerges between them. The Universalist says : “ imperfect and dull-hearted as I am, I wouldn’t burn up my children because they have done wrong and offended me ; and it is inconceivable to me that God, who is infinitely kinder of heart than I am, should do any such thing ; therefore it becomes to me a reasonable necessity to conclude that when, in the Bible, He seems to threaten any such doom even to the most incorrigible, He cannot mean it, and His words may lawfully be interpreted in some other, milder, manner.” Thus the “ Winchester Confession,” which, since 1803, has been made the test of Universalist fellowship [*Schaff-Herzog*, iii : 2429], says :

Art. II. We believe that there is one God, whose nature is love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will [i.e. because his love will eventually overpower all other attributes and considerations] finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

Now, if we understand correctly the Respondent’s theories as set forth in the publications for which he is responsible, he distinctly therein teaches two things, viz. :

1. That the believer has a right to dilute the interpretation of the Bible down to the standard of his own Christian consciousness [*Andover Review*, Oct. 1884, p. 348], thus :

The Christian consciousness of to-day, which is itself a product of the gospel, cannot be contradicted by the gospel. Hence any theories which claim to be confirmed by the Bible, yet against which Christian sentiment protests, should not be accepted. There may be waiting and confessions of ignorance, but no assent to opinions against which refined Christian sentiment rebels.

2. That, in the exercise of this right of interpretation, it is Scriptural to hold and teach that many men in this world do not have a fair chance [*Prog. Orth.* p. 251] ; that it would be inconsistent with God’s justice at the end of their earthly lives to condemn many men for what they have done in this world [*Ibid.* p. 253] ; and that therefore opportunities of salvation in the next world may confidently be predicted [*Ibid.* pp. 93, 242].

We submit that so far as this philosophy is distinguishable from

that of the Universalists, the latter has the advantage, inasmuch as — speaking reverently — it is more logical to suppose that, if God has set his heart upon extra-Scriptural and extra-mundane measures of salvation towards those dying in sin, He will carry those measures to an effectual result, than that He will allow Himself the risk of being a second time postponed and defeated.

Gentlemen of the Board of Visitors, I rest here my argument. I have tried to prove that the Andover Creed, from the influences which brought it forth, and the quarter whence it came, with the explanations and expectations which accompanied its enactment, publication, and reception by the religious world, can in no sense be justly and fairly held to suffer the teaching of probation after this life by those who are solemnly pledged to its support; and I have sought to make it clear that the Respondent in teaching that doctrine violates his obligation by going counter to no fewer than six of its definite and separate clauses. And permit me to remind you, here, that the rule which the Respondent suggests as a sufficient one for the purpose, — that so long as he, in his own conscience, is satisfied that he is honestly taking the Creed “according to the best light God shall give him,” he ought not to be disturbed in his place; is practically no rule at all, because it is susceptible of becoming all things to all men. Heterodoxy is not on another plane from the truth, or as if one must leap to another planet to reach and touch it; it is simply at the other, lower, end of a sliding scale which slants — very gradually at the first — from the place where the truth abides. Who of us cannot recall men — some still living in other communions, or cast out of all communions — who began with us in the full and fraternal holding of the same common religious doctrine; who ran well for a time; but who then slid off and hurried down — always further off and ever further down — until they plunged beyond the outmost lines of Orthodoxy — some to land in Naturalism, some in Agnosticism, some in absolute Atheism? Who does not remember the famous — I would better say infamous — John Humphrey Noyes, and how he declared himself to keep, through all his Oneida socialism and shame, — a good conscience toward God? I undertake to say that, had he been a Professor at Andover, as in 1839 he was a student there, he might — on the plea of the Respondent — have staid there till his dying day; for, to the last, he maintained that he explained the Scriptures according to the best light which

God gave him. He did what *his* "Christian consciousness" told him to do, and why was not the plea as sound for him, as for another? The truth is there must be — as I said in the beginning — a limit *somewhere*. That limit, Gentlemen, must be *good faith to the general intent of the Creed, and purpose of the Seminary*. It need not be any thing *more*; it *cannot* be any thing less.

The Seminary was founded to favor and further Evangelical Orthodoxy, as then in sharp contrast with Universalism and Unitarianism. And the question which you, as sitting in the place of the deceased Founders — to guard their rights and assure their purposes — are to settle; seems to us to be not in the least what human ingenuity can make out of their Creed and Statutes, nor what the men of this generation may conceive to be "opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men" but what Samuel Abbot and John and Phœbe Phillips, and Moses Brown and William Bartlet and John Norris conceived to be opposed to the Gospel and hazardous to human souls. Mr. Bartlet was a man of many deeds and of few words, yet we find him writing, just as this founding was going on [25 Nov., 1807], to defend his minister from a charge of overcaution as to the fundamental laws of the Institution [*Woods*, p. 534]:

He is willing to see things in this matter very sure, before he yields to the union; he is on his guard lest a perversion should take place; and I think we ought all so to be; for the enemy is breaking in like a flood; few, very few, stand forth and oppose the great infidelity that is prevailing through our land at this day; and when we do meet with any that will step forth and stand in the gap, they ought to be supported by all the friends of Zion.

And while he was writing these words, there was in type, at the office of Lincoln & Edmands, 53 Cornhill, to be sent out before a week's time in the December number of the *Panoplist*, an article, designed as an *avant-coureur* for the contemplated Seminary, entitled the "Importance of a Theological Institution" — written by a man who knew — if anybody knew — what they were proposing to found such an Institution to advocate, and what to oppose. And in the course of that article he enumerates "many erroneous doctrines" which it was intended to counteract. Among these he names "the duration of future punishment, and universal salvation." And here he goes on [*Panoplist*, Dec. 1807, p. 313]:

These and other like errors are now openly avowed and publicly taught; errors so gross, so contrary to the Gospel of Christ, that whoever had embraced them in the days of our ancestors, would have been thought a monster in religion, and deemed unworthy the Christian name.

Can any sane man suppose that such men, were they now here with unchanged convictions, could fail to regard the trend and teaching of the *Andover Review* upon Eschatology as "opposed to the Gospel of Christ, and hazardous to the souls of men?"

The way in which it manifestly lay in the minds of the Founders—and it is the way in which it lies in our minds still—is that men are by nature lost in sin; that God has interposed to save them, and, on account of what Christ has done, offers them forgiveness and salvation on their penitence and faith; and expects and commands his ministers to labor to persuade them to seek Him while He may be found, and call upon Him while He is near—going in to the marriage-feast, before the door is shut. He expects them to put upon the conscience and the fear of sinners—as Christ Himself did—the need of *striving* to enter in by the narrow door, because many "shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." That death terminates probation, and that death is liable to come to any man at any moment, in the Founders' view constituted, so to speak, the *grip* of the Gospel. They would, therefore, exceedingly have deplored the new doctrine as perilously enfeebling its power; as much so, practically, as Universalism itself. They would expect careless sinners, engrossed in worldly plans and anxieties, to be tempted by it to adopt Felix's answer to each new appeal: "go thy way for this time; and when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee." They would expect common-sense worldly men, grasping the general principles now newly enunciated—that many men do not have a "fair chance" in this world, and that all who have not a fair chance here will have one hereafter—to reason that, though others may suppose them to be having a fair chance, God knows that a thousand things come in, of which the world knows nothing, to prevent their *really* having a fair chance here; and so they will confidently await the fairer chance of the future. All this at the fearful risk—as the Founders must have thought, and as some of us still think—of the eternal loss of the soul.

We are told that this new theory is necessary for—or at least very helpful towards—a better *Theodicy*. Gentlemen, it is a very serious question whether it is worth risking the salvation of souls

for the sake of a Theodicy. Doubtless Theodicies may be useful in removing objections from a certain class of minds, but did any one ever personally know of any man who was turned "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that he might receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith," by a Theodicy?

Let it then, Mr. President, be distinctly understood what we claim, what we oppose, and what we ask. We claim that the Respondent has gone beyond all just boundaries of the Evangelical faith in the direction of Universalism; that his reasonings are logically indistinguishable from those of Universalists, so that Universalists are justified in claiming, as they do claim, him as a substantial — though not yet a self-confessed — recruit to their ranks. We oppose his further continuance in this false, and for the Seminary perilous, position. And we ask that as conservators of the Creed and Statutes of the Seminary, you will admonish or remove him, as to your judgment shall seem wisest and best.

We have — we repeat — never objected, and never desired to object, to any legitimate progress in that Seminary within the limits of Evangelical truth. We have no desire to criticise any adjustments of New School or Old School, nor do we find fault with any philosophy of explanation of the doctrines of the Gospel which preserves their Orthodoxy under the Creed. What we object to, and all that we object to, is, that the Respondent has gone beyond the utmost reasonable limits of such lawful progress, and broken out into a substantial heterodoxy to which the Creed stands necessarily and ineradicably opposed.

But, it is said that consequences should give us pause. It has been claimed that to enforce the Statutes in their literal strictness, would be to destroy the Seminary by depopulating it of instructors. Yet we do not believe that all the Westminster theologians are dead, nor that it would prove a thing impossible — if even very difficult — were every one of these professorial chairs left vacant to-morrow, speedily to find competent men to fill them, who could take the Creed not only in the sense, but with all the cordiality, of the Founders. Yet if that could not be, we respectfully submit that there would be no doubt that the Courts, by virtue of a decree of *Cy-pres*, would re-establish *some* legal method by which men with a conscience could conscientiously fill the vacant places. But if *that* could not be, we still further submit that it might be better to close the Seminary, than to keep it open through a chronic and

crescent dishonesty which cannot fail to infect and poison every rill of influence flowing thence.

And on this point we beg leave to adopt the language of one who "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first," and who early contemplated the exact contingency here suggested. More than a generation has passed since he said [Woods, 362]:

But suppose the time should come, when no man could be found, who, besides possessing the other necessary qualifications, would be willing to subscribe to the Doctrinal Standard appointed by the Founders, taken without any exceptions, in its true and obvious sense. What should be done? Without hesitation I reply that the Guardians of the Institution, rather than countenance any deviations from the Creed, or any violation of the Statutes, should suspend the operation of the Seminary. The principle of public justice and official fidelity is far more important than any good which could be accomplished by an unlawful use of charity funds.

Even heathen ethics rose to the height of the maxim: *fiat justitia, ruat cælum*. And may it not be possible that a great silence on that "holy hill" — dumb for the truth's sake — might more make for righteousness than a thousand voices issuing thence to proclaim a message which, to the minds which commissioned it to speak, God never sent?

Sir! the heavens never do fall, when right things — though they be perplexing, and sad, and difficult things — are done; but those right things bear themselves aloft as pillars of salvation on which the great future rests calm and secure.

And this is what we ask from you — a RIGHT decision. We hold the Respondent in sincere respect and long regard. We should esteem it a genuine misfortune to the cause of sacred learning were he to be displaced. We have never so much as suspected his perfect integrity of purpose. Could he resume his ancient relation of fidelity to the truth as he formerly held and taught it, we should ask for no better man in his place. But we do not see how he, or even an angel from heaven, preaching another gospel than that which the Creed preaches, can be in the way of his duty in the chair which he holds in the Seminary.

Gentlemen, we have counted ourselves happy, that, in this painful and difficult task, we have had the privilege to speak to those who are expert in all these customs and questions, and who have nobly illustrated an unbounded patience. Eminent in Church, and eminent in State, and eminent in both Church and State, each of

you has been already privileged to associate his name with useful and shining deeds. But, in whatever distinguished manner you may already have served your generation, suffer me to say that I believe — in the greatness and far reach of the issues now awaiting your decision — you confront the supreme moment of your lives !

God help you so to decide this weighty question that by and by — *seri in cælum redeatis* — it shall be given you to greet with exceeding joy the good and generous men whom you represent to-day in your solemn office ; and with a still richer ecstasy to stand approved in the radiant presence of Him whom to know is Life — whom to serve is Heaven !

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY HON. E. R. HOAR.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN, — When about two years ago, two years ago, I think it was, last summer, some gentlemen of eminence in the branch of the Congregational Church which has Andover largely for its representative, came to me for advice as a lawyer on what were the remedies which the law gave them, and in what manner those remedies should be pursued in the case of a departure from the Creed of the Seminary at Andover, I felt it was a very high professional compliment. Those gentlemen were aware that I had not entertained the same theological opinions which belong to that institution, or to their branch of the Congregational denomination. I gave them a written opinion. And when, afterward, a committee of the alumni and one of the Trustees were about to present to the notice of this Board of Visitors a matter, and ask them to take the action upon it which their sense of duty might require, I was again applied to as to the form and method of presentation; what the questions would be for your decision, and by what rules of evidence or form of procedure the case would be governed. And again I consented to appear before your Board, and that is my whole connection with the case. I was gratified to find that these gentlemen, representing as I believe a considerable constituency, were satisfied that I could attend to the legal aspects of their case, to what rules of law and of procedure should govern its presentation, somewhat to their assistance, and to produce the result that there might be an effectual decision of the question which interested their minds.

I have been sorry when coming here to find in the opening of the case for the respondent, by the eminent counsel who was employed to render that service, that he thought it necessary, that he even could think it possible that it could be of any use to him or his client's cause, to make the personal attack which he did

upon these gentlemen who conduct this prosecution, if you may term it so. When they signed themselves "A committee of the Alumni," and have stated before you that they were such, and it was not set out who these particular alumni were, he drew the charitable construction, without the slightest evidence to support it, which he stated in these words of his pamphlet: "The object of this description apparently was to gain a credit for their charges by appearing to act in a representative character." And he then says, "As it now appears, these four men comprise all the Trustees and all the alumni who engineer this movement." What makes it so appear? Who has been asked to testify about it? Who has intimated any such thing, except the gentleman in his speech, and on a subject upon which apparently he has no personal knowledge, and therefore I take it, did not undertake to appear as a witness concerning it. And upon that foundation he goes on and compares these gentlemen to the men in buckram of Falstaff: "What slaves are ye to hack your swords as ye have done, and then say it was in fight!" A pretty strong suggestion of falsehood and deceit in gentlemen occupying the position of Christian ministers, and men of character, in this community! Does my friend who made that statement, I must believe without due consideration, think that this Board of Visitors are a set of fools; that you come here in absolute ignorance of whatever has happened in this country in theological circles within the last two or three years? No following! Men in buckram! Has my friend heard nothing of the echoes of the great contest at Des Moines? Is this a new matter that is suddenly put before you by some pretenders, or is it a grave question in the Christian churches, on which your authority has been invoked, and on which your decision will be held in great value by a large company of Christian believers?

There is a good deal in my brother's opening of this case on which, if time would serve, — and I do not wish to take up much time on it, — I should desire to comment a little. There followed this attack upon the gentlemen who conduct, at your request, this prosecution, various technical objections to the mode of procedure. At the earlier hearing of the case, when we first came before this Board, the objection was that it ought to be governed by all the rules of criminal procedure, and it was urged and urged strenuously. A change of heart, or a change of mind, seems to have come across the gentlemen who made that contention; and now

they say it is a suit in the nature of a suit in equity governing a trust, and that it is enforcing a contract, and that the rules of civil procedure must be followed, and there must be a party in interest who has a right to prosecute. Well, I thought we went over all that sufficiently, and I think all that needs to be said about that now is that under the Establishment of this Institution for theological education at Andover, the Founders have provided that there should be a Board of Visitors, whose duty it should be to see that the scheme upon which their foundation was established should be faithfully pursued and carried out, whose duty it is made to inquire into it, and who, when they come to execute that duty, may act for themselves, just as far as they please.

This is not any suit to transfer the funds at Andover. It is not a suit on the part of the public to see if there is a perversion of trust. And I may say that as this opening address was made, I concluded at the time it was addressed much more to the audience in the further part of the hall than to the tribunal; and it got to be almost curiously noticeable that sometimes in the most impressive parts of it, when I looked up at the gentleman who was delivering it, his back was turned entirely to the tribunal, and his remarks were all delivered in the other direction. This Board is not governed by any system of ecclesiastical law, and it was not held to be so by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts when they had the matter under consideration in the case of Prof. Murdock. The Board of Visitors, whose duty it is to see that a thing is carried on in a certain way, and upon a certain scheme, have a right to inform themselves, have a right to proceed in any manner which is suitable and proper to give them the information necessary to discharge their duty; the only limitation being that, where they are to deal with a question which affects a private right, like the continuance of a professor in his office, they must proceed consistently with the legal principles which protect personal rights, and that is the whole of it. Our friends talk about this being like a libel in an ecclesiastical court, a suit in equity, a case which must have a party in interest for the plaintiff; there is no such case here, nothing of the sort. You gentlemen, under the constitution of the Andover Theological Seminary assumed certain duties. You were yourselves required each to make and subscribe to a declaration of your belief in the Seminary Creed, and you were enjoined, and by the acceptance of the trust you promised and engaged, to look to it that the purpose of the found-

ers in maintaining that Creed should be preserved inviolate in that institution, so far as you had jurisdiction and authority. And when by a complaint from the community at large, or by the request of any single man who chooses to come to you, (because in the diffusion and teaching of religious truth every member of the community and of the human race has an interest,) you feel obliged to exercise your authority and make an inquiry, you say to the person or persons who have called to your attention the current rumors or criticisms, whatever term may be used, with regard to the teaching at Andover as being inconsistent with the Creed, We will inquire into it, and for greater convenience we ask you to inform us in what particulars, and by whom, any act is done in violation of the constitution of the Seminary. They do so, and they come before you and offer you the proof. You take their statement and send it to the person concerned, to give him a full and fair hearing, with every possibility of stating any defence or any objection to the prosecution; and then you proceed to inquire, under your official duty, with that aid in presenting the case on one side, whatever you choose to allow, which we may give,—and we have no standing before you except by your allowance,—and with the fullest opportunity and right to be heard by himself and counsel on the part of the respondent. You are restricted only by the rules and principles of law which entitle every man to a fair trial,—that is to say, that he shall know what is charged against him with sufficient clearness to understand and answer it, that he shall have opportunity to furnish any argument or evidence in his defence which he desires, within the bounds of a reasonable limit of time. And then you decide the question.

And when you have decided it, as I understand it, if you have proceeded according to the principles of natural and legal justice, your decision is conclusive, because you have conformed to the law in all that the law has any charge of, or concern in. You are the tribunal to determine the theological question. When it is said that a Professor has taught or inculcated doctrines which are inconsistent with and contrary to the Andover Creed, doctrines which he was bound to oppose, you are to determine what is the just exposition of the Creed in regard to those doctrines, and whether those doctrines thus taught are antagonistic to it. That is your duty, which you have voluntarily and solemnly assumed. If on a pretence something were set forth that had nothing to do with the Creed, which was not in itself improper and unbecoming

behavior, inconsistent with the position of the Professor, and you should proceed to remove the Professor on that ground, the Court would interfere, because you had exceeded your jurisdiction, because you had undertaken to remove from office a Professor who held the office not subject to that exception. But where there is and can be no doubt, I apprehend, in anybody's mind, that the only question is whether doctrines taught by the Professor continue to support and be in consistency with the Creed of the Seminary, on that question of the interpretation of the Creed, and of its consistency with the teachings of the Professor, your judgment is the final one. In deciding that question, you will have proceeded according to the law and according to the duty committed to your charge.

The next thing I wish to comment on in this somewhat remarkable, very able and eloquent and, in many respects, interesting opening of my brother Dwight, is that, after passing through these technical objections, a great deal of space is devoted to criticism of the Andover Creed. It is hardly necessary for me to read passages, but on looking it over, when you shall have occasion to do so, you will find that the intimation is constantly made that such a Creed is not appropriate for such an Institution, and should not be encouraged or tolerated, if you can help it. I think that is a fair statement of the effect of Mr. Dwight's discussion of the subject. He has addressed to you a strong, clear, valuable and impressive argument, if the question before you had been what it is wise and best to do in regard to religious opinions, and the form of religious instruction. It would have been an admirable argument to address to a constitutional convention determining whether there should be any restraint upon religious liberty. It would have been, perhaps, very appropriate to have addressed to the assembly of Westminster divines, if he, instead of the Boston and Hartford clergymen, who he thought would have improved that body so much if they could have gone over there, could have gone himself and delivered it before them. I certainly sympathize heartily, and I cannot but believe that my clients do, and the Respondents we know do, with the doctrine that the right of man to hold his convictions on religious subjects with no responsibility but to his God, and with perfect freedom for inquiry, is one of the best settled of American institutions. We all abide by it and all accept it. But what has that great doctrine to do with this case? It has no more to do with it than what the elo-

quent gentleman, who spoke in so impressive and loud a tone at the close of the respondent's case, said about Procrustes's bed, — that you were putting the professors of Andover on a Procrustean bed, and you should not do any thing of that kind; the furniture of the Andover bed-chambers, if you did that, he thought would be horrid. But that is an argument against having any Creed; and when that question comes up before any body, I shall listen to the exposition of my friend on the subject with great pleasure, and I have no doubt with comfort and satisfaction.

But that is not the question before you, gentlemen of this Board of Visitors. The whole of Prof. Dwight's argument on that subject, as the whole burden of all his associates have said, has been that you must somehow or other construe this Creed into something that it never meant, if you find that it comes across any gentleman's opinions, who is honestly and studiously, in the fear of God and the love of man, endeavoring to pursue a course of instruction. That has nothing to do with the question that I came here to hear discussed, and I think, having listened attentively, I was going to say nine, but I should say, perhaps, fifteen or sixteen hours, to what has been said in behalf of the Respondents, that very much too much time has been devoted to that which has nothing to do with the case.

It has been stated that the New England idea, and the idea of Cromwell and his Independents, was to claim for any Creed that it should be favorable to tender consciences. My recollection travels back, — I have not verified it, and so it is not to be taken as a citation that brother Russell has got to have to look over and make an answer to, — to a time when I read that Oliver Cromwell, on one occasion when an Irish town that he was going to take by storm sent a flag of truce to capitulate, and in proposing terms of capitulation asked among other things that they should have liberty of conscience, replied in this memorable utterance, after discussing the other terms of capitulation: "As for what you say touching liberty of conscience, God forbid that I should ever disturb any man's conscience. But if by liberty of conscience you mean liberty to celebrate the Mass, God forbid that that should ever be allowed where the Parliament of England hath authority." (Laughter.)

MR. RUSSELL. That is the exact precedent you put this case under. You say, "You may have liberty of conscience if you do not infringe on these gentlemen."

Mr. HOAR. You may have liberty of conscience where you have a right to be in its exercise. Liberty of conscience is not to be indulged which will exclude others who have equal rights. My friend and neighbor, Mr. Emerson, I remember once saying in a public address, when the subject of liberty of speech was under consideration, that he thought sufficient attention had not been devoted to the right of people to the liberty of their ears; and I do not know but the Visitors think that in the discussion that has gone on here, that fundamental right has been a little infringed. (Laughter.)

When you go off on to the question of liberty of conscience, the point is, where do you draw the line? That our Pilgrim fathers, and Oliver Cromwell and his Ironsides, and the Founders of the Andover Seminary, and a large body of the Congregational Church of this very day, have certain convictions which they consider absolutely essential to any religious character, however erroneously, I do not think any intelligent person can deny. And when some donors, holding these convictions, and with that feeling, have undertaken to say that in the Institution which they established instruction shall be carefully confined to a certain line, and have a right legally to say so, and the question is whether the instruction given conforms to that line, there is no question arising about liberty of conscience, or whether it would have been best for them to do it. *They have done it*, and there it is.

Now, I wish to call attention to one thing in this Creed. I do not admire it myself, — and I speak with thorough respect to this tribunal, and to the authors of the Andover Creed, and all concerned, — but it is there. They regarded it as a matter concerning vital Christian truth, the relation of man to his Maker and to his fellow men, to his duty and his destiny; and more serious topics, never to be approached but with gravity, solemnity, even, of thought and utterance, could not be found. And when I am upon the question of how much importance these Founders attached to their Creed, in connection with this Institution, I may call your attention to what seems to me a marvellous expression of it. I doubt whether it would be adopted in our time in that form, or in that way. It is at the beginning, where the Professor is required to be a Master of Arts, discreet, honest, learned, a devout Christian and “an orthodox, and consistent Calvinist;” and after careful examination by the Visitors with reference to his religious principles, he shall, on the day of his inauguration, “publicly make

and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in divine revelation, and in the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel, as expressed in the following Creed, which *is*," — not which *are*, and the verb is most important in that connection, not "the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel, which *are* supported." but, — "the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel as expressed in the following Creed, which *is* supported by the infallible revelation which God constantly makes of himself in His works of creation, providence and redemption."

Well, perhaps, to most of our modern habits of thought and speech, the idea which that literally expresses, that the thunders among the mountains, the roar of the sea, the beauty of the dawn, of the sunset, and of the starry heavens, are the infallible supporters of the Andover Creed, would not be the style of expression we should select, but it is worthy of attention because it points out so strongly what these Founders meant, and how they felt about the Creed. They felt that they had, after these seven or eight months of reflection, got together an expression of the designs of God in creation, in the continuance of the race, in the redemption of man, in the object of man's existence, in the nature of all the relations between God and man, and man and his fellow men, so explicit and clear and in such plain language, the best that the country and the times afforded, that they had exhausted the subject. And they provided, and proceeded formally to provide, that that was to be retained and never altered in any jot or tittle, that it should so forever be.

On such a proposition, where is there room for stating rules of construction which are to be given according to the general effect which one construction or the other might produce in your view of what ought to be established in the community? The argument leads at once to an absurdity. It is said that the Professor when he subscribes to this Creed, also undertakes, while adhering to all these and other doctrines of our religion which are not stated, that he will explain the Scriptures and teach in the Seminary according to the best light God has given him. Well, that is his duty as a Christian man, as a man of conscience. But did any of the Founders who formed that Creed ever suppose it would be possible that any one signing that Creed, adopting that Creed, undertaking to teach that Creed, not to be altered in one sentence or letter forever, could arrive at conclusions, by following any light that God should give him, which were utterly inconsistent

with and repugnant to it, and yet continue to be recognized as a proper instructor upon the foundation? I apprehend not. What a man may do, he must decide between himself and his God and his fellow men for himself. Where he shall do it is not infrequently a question which involves the rights of somebody else. I have heard of an English gentleman, said to be converted to Paganism early in this century, who complained as an invasion of his liberty of conscience, and as persecution for his religious opinions, that his landlady in a London boarding-house was not willing he should sacrifice a bull to Jupiter in her back parlor. As an illustration that is, perhaps, a little coarse, but it applies here. The back parlor of the Andover Founders is not a place to teach the Christian religion, even, if it does not conform to what they say is the Creed which God in His works of providence, creation and redemption has infallibly shown it to be. They did not consider as the Christian religion anything which was repugnant to that, and they had a right so to decide for themselves and their benefaction.

The question, therefore, Gentlemen, as it has been stated with great accuracy several times, comes back to this: You are to determine, whether under the articles of the complaint and the specifications, anything which has been taught and inculcated by this Respondent is inconsistent with and repugnant to the Seminary Creed, and therefore prohibited, by the provisions of the Founders, in the Seminary teaching.

I entirely agree with my brethren on the other side in what has been said as to the rule of charitable construction, and I thought one of the illustrations, — I think it was used by my brother Russell, — was pretty good, so far as it went. He said the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States each take an oath to support the Constitution, and that they sit and hear cases as they come before them, and when they come to decide some constitutional question, there will sometimes be four on one side and five on the other. but that nobody thinks of charging the minority with a violation of trust, or of a breach of their official oath, because they did not coincide with the views of the majority. So far that sounds well, and so far I have nothing to object to in its application to the case before you.

I will say for myself once for all, — and I am not employed, certainly I am sure my clients do not think I could be hired to suppress the opinion or to entertain a different one, — that I

listened with great admiration to the defence of Prof. Smyth, and that I look upon him as an upright, able, conscientious, Christian man, eminently so, and nothing involved in this case would lead me to question it. And there is nothing in this case which involves it. There may be suggestions here and there, as there were those which I thought very unworthy attacks on the prosecutors, about a Professor attempting to smother or to conceal his opinions, to hold on to his place, or something of that kind. I do not think there is a man in Massachusetts, who ever heard of him, who would believe or would suggest such a thing. He has been throughout manly, and honorable, and frank, before you. The poor statement that we had not called any witnesses to swear that they ever heard him say such things, which was intimated by one of his counsel, and the suggestion that we had not called any of his pupils to show that these things were taught in the lecture-room, were all done away with by his own manly utterance that he was not here to say that any view which he had entertained and published on important theological questions did not find its way into the lecture-room. That is not the question, let me repeat, between the Visitors and the Professor. It is not the question whether his opinions are or are not very much better than those of the Creed. If new light breaks out from God's word, in the phrase of Robinson, or if in teaching, under the injunction of the Foundation, according to the best light that God has given him, he teaches something which is for the world's interest, and the interest of every student of theology, he should be welcomed to the work by every friend of religion and of freedom. But at the same time there is no question about it here. The question is whether that is to be preached in the building put up by the donors' money, and to be supported by their funds, when you find that it is not consistent with, but that it is a new thought which disposes of, sets aside, vacates the foundation upon which they built their Institution.

There is no breach of trust suggested against Prof. Smyth by me, and there has not been. It must have been only casually, by inference, if it has ever been introduced into these proceedings. We never expected any such thing would be done. It is the Board of Visitors that for the first time will commit a breach of trust, if, honestly believing on full and careful examination that the doctrines taught by Prof. Smyth are inconsistent with and subversive of the Seminary Creed, they do not say so, when they have ac-

cepted a trust which requires them to say so. The complainants have said, undoubtedly, many times, and in many forms, that they consider it would be a great breach of trust to allow the Andover Institution, founded for such purposes, and with such limitations and restrictions as it was, to be carried on by teaching what is taught. It is not a prosecution for heresy; it is not a persecution of any individual that is sought. So far from being heretical, they may be moral, pious and Christian to any extent. That is not the question before you, Gentlemen, as you sit watching the trepidations of the balance. Do these two things correspond? I am willing to allow and to suggest that the rule of charitable construction shall go as far as it has been claimed to go, in some respects. The judge of the Supreme Court who differs from his brethren, from the time the opinion is announced by the majority who decide the law, is bound by it, and whenever he holds a court in the country he has got to rule the law and hold the law as the majority have decided it. If he is not prepared to do that, if that decision does not convince his mind so that he can honestly and fairly state it, he cannot continue to go on with his judicial office. I think we had in Massachusetts a pretty noticeable example once of a gentleman by the name of Curtis, who was a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, at the time of the Dred-Scott decision, resigned his office because he could not quite stand the constitutional views of the persons there. Beyond that, however, I am willing to concede to this rule of charitable construction all that I think can properly be asked for it.

Now, to make a single suggestion, and with absolute respect, — I have not had an opportunity, and I do not know as I should have done it if I had, to ask either of the gentlemen whether what I imply is not true, — when it says in this Creed that “the wicked will wake to shame and everlasting contempt, and with devils be plunged into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone for ever and ever,” I might ask, do the Calvinist, the Orthodox Congregationalists of the present day, do the Presbyterians, do the members of this Board of Visitors, believe that that is intended to describe some literal lake, whatever the shores of such a lake might be, situated somewhere, and consisting of what we find so terrible to our bodies, if they get into it, fire and brimstone? I suppose it is generally understood that the Christian world, most of it, at least, would say that that was a figurative expression. If I am wrong, I have no right to use the argument; but it is in the

interest of what I should consider to be the proper mode of construction. God's wrath against wickedness, the punishment of sin, the method of man's redemption and salvation being the essentials, if upon those particulars every thing is agreed, — while an unlearned person might believe Scripture with absolute literalness in all its terms, and with a thoughtful person it would go without saying that certain expressions, though of terrible substance and import, were not intended to be a literal account by a personal observer of a physical fact, — there would be no trouble in explaining the Andover Creed, to say that where its essence and spirit, the rules that it lays down, the essential things it contains, are approved and adhered to in instruction, then a difference on such points and matters would be immaterial.

Probably nobody ever heard an important truth stated with exactly the same comprehension and application of it that his next neighbor did, who heard it at the same time. There is an immense diversity, not only in men's comprehending, but in their mental perception of truth, which is very much affected by culture and reflection, and by the Spirit of God. And within any such limits, I should not think for a moment that this tribunal would entertain this complaint. But you must draw a line somewhere. I should suppose that if any doctrine, held as a distinctive doctrine by the interesting company of persons, not intended in any way to be approved, commended or forwarded by the Foundation of the Andover Theological Seminary, who seem to be grouped here at the end of the Creed, almost on the principle of the tares, binding them in bundles to burn them, — “In opposition not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists, and all other heresies and errors,” — I should suppose that there could be no doubt that if there were anything which could be included in that list, which could be proved and established in this theological discussion as having been taught by a Professor at Andover, you would have no difficulty about it.

Nor should you have any difficulty, it would seem to me, if anything which is a distinctive doctrine, as it was understood by the Founders; (and it hardly needs to be argued here, because it must have been understood by you gentlemen who have taken the subscription to this Creed,) if what you understood as essential in any part of this Creed is contradicted by the teaching of an Andover

Professor, I submit you have assumed the duty that you will by appropriate methods cause that to cease. Take an extreme case, Papists. There have been some remarkable conversions, starting with New England Congregationalism even, to the Church of Rome. The liberty of the Church of Rome is as dear to every American citizen as that of any other church, as far as it rests on the intelligent choice of the member of that church. Many of our objections to it are on the ground that it does not consist with personal and individual liberty; but so far as that goes we are not now taking that into view. Supposing an Andover Professor, by the best light God has given him, should conclude that the sacrifice of the Mass was the thing which was required to be encouraged, and that the infallibility of the Pope or of an ecumenical council, — I do not mean any such sort of council as Dr. Dexter held down at Plymouth, but one of the Catholic affairs, — was to be the governing force. There is no use in talking about whether that could be taught at Andover under the Creed.

An argument has been submitted to you that the doctrine held by the Respondent amounts substantially to what was taught by the head of the Universalist denomination in this vicinity at the time the Creed was drawn and established. Universalism clearly could not be taught at Andover under the Creed. No charitable construction, so as not to be a clog on a teacher, can reach the point. It is a question of where you draw the line. Where you come to anything which this Board of Visitors regard as the substance of Christian doctrine, as expressed in the Andover Creed, and they find that the teachings in the Seminary by any Professor are in contravention or open disregard of that, their duty under the trust which they have assumed arises, and is to be performed.

I do not propose to go into a single theological consideration as to whether that is the fact or not. It has been presented to you on both sides with great ability. I certainly, speaking for myself, should be very much inclined at once to say "*non nobis tantas componere lites.*" I should get out of my depth very easily. There have been ringing through my head in my dreams by night during this week of the closing hours of the year, some of these theological phrases, which I can only, as my personal wish, hope may be profitable and of importance to the people who believe in them. The question before you does not involve any niceties of theological discussion. The question for you is, not can a man hold such and such a view, — because human be-

ings hold all sorts of views and every variety of them, — but can a man, a Christian man, thoroughly imbued with the principles of the Scriptures, and in the fear of God and devotion to Christ, reading and construing fairly this body of doctrine, and believing and adhering to it, hold a particular doctrine which it is proved that he does hold? With all reasonable explanations, with all proper charitable constructions, can he continue in good faith to inculcate that Creed, and at the same time the doctrine in question? If he can, your duty is easy and pleasant. If he cannot, it is your duty to say so, whether pleasant or otherwise.

I have been asked by my associate to make a little comment upon the Norris case. You will see, Gentlemen, when you come to look at this case, if you have occasion to do so, that it is as simple a case as ever was, and has no application of the kind which is made by our friends on the other side. In the Norris case the Court had before them the original Foundation of the Andover Academy, — nothing to do with the Theological School. That Foundation provided for the instruction of the youth in virtue and in piety, and in certain branches of secular education. It also provided that as there might be youth there who were seeking to enter the ministry, they should have instructions in the principles of the Gospel, a certain number of doctrines, three or four, which at that time were considered as clearly and unquestionably principles of the Gospel, according to all persons having any connection with Andover. There is not a reference in it to Calvin or Calvinism, to Hopkins or Hopkinsianism. It goes on to say that its purpose is first, to teach the virtue of right living to the young, and second, to teach them the human knowledge which is requisite for their proper success in life.

On that is grafted afterwards a Theological Seminary, and the Theological Seminary has two sets of supporters, or those who wish to be supporters, and they make a compromise in adopting this Creed. Some of their opinions may not be strictly, theologically, carefully considered, consistent with each other. The Hopkinsians and the Calvinists differed undoubtedly in some particulars which we can now make out in the distance. The Supreme Court were asked on behalf of the heirs of the lady who gave this fund to the Seminary, to say that Phillips Academy, which was the corporation to which the Seminary was attached, could not take it, for two reasons: One was that a corporation could not take a trust of that kind and hold it. That the Court

disposed of. The other one, and the only one which has been spoken of here, was that the opinions held in the Theological Seminary were such that giving the fund to that, under this Creed, was not according to the design of the original founders. And the counsel made the mistake of supposing that the original Founders of the Theological Seminary were intended, and the subsequent Associate Foundation was intended. But the Court say no. Here is an Academy to train youth in piety and virtue, and to give them a good education, and it has a provision in it that, as some of them may be ministers afterwards, it is desirable to instruct them in the principles of the Christian religion, and it enumerates some few of those. And now you argue that they cannot take a fund and hold it for the purpose of assisting in the education of these ministers, because it is inconsistent with the design of the founders, because they have set forth these few articles. And the Court say that on reading them over they cannot see that there is any inconsistency between them. It is perfectly consistent with the original design of the Founders that young men should be taught and carefully instructed in piety and virtue, and in getting a good literary education; and that they shall also afterwards be educated for the gospel ministry, and that the foundation may be established for that purpose; that there is no doubt that is not repugnant to the design of the Founders, and that putting in these items of faith, which were enumerated to be taught by one teacher in the Academy, would not be inconsistent, as far as they had stated it, with any thing either in Hopkinsianism or Calvinism.

That is the whole that case decided. And what application has that to this case? It sustained a charitable bequest where there was no reason why it should not be sustained. The question here is whether the doctrine taught corresponds with the Creed which you have before you, with the interpretation which you think should be put upon it, which you put upon it yourselves. That is the whole practical question, as I have said before.

~~SECRET~~

OC 9 '59

MAR 25 1966

MAR 3 72

3 2400 00661 1176

[illegible]

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All figures are subject to recall.

